

A STUDY IN IDEALS :
GREAT BRITAIN AND INDIA

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE PROBLEM OF EXISTENCE :

Its Mystery, Struggle, and Comfort in the
Light of Aryan Wisdom. Demy 8vo, cloth,
10s. 6d.

IMPRESSIONS OF A WANDERER.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s. net.

LONDON : T. FISHER UNWIN

A STUDY IN IDEALS: GREAT BRITAIN AND INDIA

BY

MANMATH C. MALLIK

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FELLOW OF THE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON,
AUTHOR OF "THE PROBLEM OF EXISTENCE," ETC.

T. FISHER UNWIN
LONDON: ADELPHI TERRACE
LEIPSIC: INSELSTRASSE 20

1912

(All rights reserved)

“These are chief of human duties: first, to study
holy lore ;
Next, to guard the home from danger, help the
needy at the door ;
Then, to pass the days apart ; and next, to
centre thoughts above ;
Virtuous life—its final goal is Truth and all-
embracing love.”

THE MAHÁBHÁRATA.
(*Aryan Epic.*)

“Philosophy has for its proper subject the idea
of Good—the true end of being.”

PLATO.

PREFACE

THE attainment of happiness is the aim of every sentient being. But the way is known to few ; and the few that may, if they seriously choose, attain it, are often diverted from their aim by other occupations. It is prudent to attend first to occupations that are of a temporary nature but that have all the same to be gone through, in order that one may without interruption engage in the more serious and engrossing work of life. The temporary occupations, however, are so many and so necessary for daily life that energies get exhausted and time is with difficulty found to seek the chief aim of existence. Happiness that is worth having and likely to be lasting can be attained only by directing all energies towards a high standard of excellence in the department in which one's lot may be cast whether by choice or by compulsion. Life becomes humdrum, sordid, and miserable when it has only pleasure and the satisfaction of the natural appetites to think of, and no great ideal to strive for ; and individuals and nations decay and perish when ennobling incentives, undaunted by difficulties and hindrances, cease to prompt their actions.

To short-sighted worldliness, unable to comprehend or to foresee the infinite potentialities of the human mind, liberation of the passing hour and the immediate future from cares and worries, which may have attended the past or which may be apprehended at any time, is of supreme concern. But something more than an avoidance of, or an attempt to be free from, cares is needed to make life worth living and to leave to survivors, when the inevitable dissolution comes, a legacy that may carry them forward towards the goal of unalloyed happiness.

In the present volume, after a consideration of idealism, with the hindrances and the aids to its attainment, individual and national life in the two countries with which the author is best acquainted is treated, with a view to discover from their

past and present conditions how far they are on the road to the attainment of human ideals, and how far their success is likely to secure or to mar the permanent welfare of mankind. These two countries (with smaller adjuncts) form at the present day a great Empire, the like of which in moral and material greatness has never been known in this world. That Empire has the capacity beyond any other extant State to mould for good the destiny of the human race; and, moreover, it knows the secrets by which that destiny may eventually be achieved.

Aryanland, or India (as she has in recent times been named by Occidental travellers), has a past of which any land might well be proud. Her energies in that glorious dim past were directed, not only to secure proficiency in the arts of peace and war, but also to discover true freedom—the means to liberate the soul from its mundane, impure, ephemeral environments, and to attain that blissful state in which the anxieties and troubles as well as the pleasures of the passing hour may be treated as dreams bound to vanish when awakening comes. Moral torpor (the result of conceit), neglect of material interests, and civil strife (the consequence of prolonged immunity from foreign wars and invasions) brought on decadence; and India has for centuries been the target of conquering ambition, and has been driven to play the ignoble part of demoralising those foreigners that have come in contact with her. By the dispensation of Providence the vivifying force of British connection, teaching, and example is electrifying her again to life and usefulness. In exchange for that teaching India is bound to communicate to her preceptor and partner in weal or woe some of the spiritual force that has enabled her to survive material disasters and that is so necessary for safeguarding prosperity and happiness.

Britain, of all lands, has the most dazzling present, made glorious by the efforts of great minds to make her the happiest land on earth by securing for her freedom of development in all departments of life—intellectual, personal, and political

liberty, which, combined with toleration, consideration for fellow-men, and fondness for order, can alone lead mankind to the possession of uniform and undying bliss. She has in recent years been subject to the dangerous leaven of reaction, imported by misguided men and women with unbalanced judgments, who come in contact with backward and despotically governed portions of mankind, and who, unable to secure social justice at home, find consolation in advocating and imposing under the name of patriotism upon fellow-subjects abroad inequality and injustice. The leaven, however, is likely to grow less as illumination spreads over mankind; and British instincts and traditions may in due course be expected to assert their sway over satanic forces, which always present themselves in the field of human struggle to test the constancy of men.

The political union of the two lands, so different in ideals and in fortunes, appears to be destined not merely to form the largest agglomeration of human beings united under one Sovereign and one banner with common aims and like fortunes, but also to evolve mutual influences for good. The one may impart the philosophic temperament, which in struggle, success, or failure, retains a uniform serenity, without which the capacity for virile effort is marred by undue elation or despondency; the other may communicate physical and mental energy, and the spirit of unrest, without which the glory of life and its ideals cannot be attained. The union of the two, when placed on the solid foundation of sympathy and toleration, may be expected to play the most conspicuous part in the future history of the human race.

In the atmosphere of so-called Imperialism, which has come to cloud British instincts, it is difficult enough for one born in Britain to criticise thoughts and acts done in the name of Britain without being taunted as unpatriotic. It is much more difficult for a Briton not born although bred in Britain to criticise things British. If one criticises disparagingly

however much such criticism may be in sorrow and however honestly it may be intended to point out remediable defects, one is set down as an enemy of Britain. If one applauds, one is regarded as a hypocrite, profuse in outward flattery while consumed with inward hate. According to the "patriotic" critics "manhood must be melted into courtesies, valour into compliment." As, however, it is impossible to please every critic even by courtesy and compliment, one bent upon doing one's best to serve the cause of one's fellow-citizens and of humanity at large must follow the dictation of one's own conscience and heart and let the critics say what pleases them.

To speak out one's mind regarding things Indian is at the present day the most thankless of all tasks.

"Words do well

When he that speaks them pleases those that hear."

There are so many parties of different interests and temperaments that it would be difficult for the most gifted and popular of men to please them all. In Britain, as well as in India, there are the two camps opposed to each other, one for advance, the other for delay if not retrogression. Both sides, however, must be equally interested in the welfare and happiness of themselves and their fellow-citizens, and the only question that may divide them is the means by which the end may be achieved. In India a complication has arisen in an apparent antagonism between the Government and the people, the Government having become suspicious of the loyalty of the people and afraid lest their aims be not to improve but to subvert authority, while the people charge the officials of the Government with a want of the sense of duty and of the faculty of observation, with subservience to interested foreign dictation, and with hesitation to keep pace with the progressive spirit of the times that is apparent in every country in Europe and Asia.

Under the circumstances it is no easy matter to say anything on either side. If anything is said on behalf of the Government, it may be taken as siding with reaction and despotism—proceedings that no sane man can possibly uphold, except perhaps as a temporary necessity. If, on the other hand, anything is said on behalf of the people, it may be distorted into an encouragement of the spirit of resistance to authority which has, in imitation of the West, manifested itself, and which, if not speedily allayed, can bode no good either to the Government or to the people, to Britain, to India, or to mankind at large. Authority, however much it is the duty of every citizen to support it, has, in addition to the power in its hands, plenty of backers in all grades of life. Unlike merciful Heaven,

“That rather with his sharp and sulphurous bolt
Splits the unwedgeable and gnarled oak
Than the soft myrtle,”

people have a disposition to side with power even when it errs; while the merciless reactionary enemy of progress takes positive pleasure in hurting the weak and helpless, and in attempting to perpetuate human miseries.

In such conditions the difficulty of an ardent idealist in attempting to present both sides fairly—though perhaps with more personal sympathy for the weaker than for the stronger side—will, it is hoped, be appreciated, at any rate by the more generous among his opponents.

Since the greater part of this book was written a great stroke of statesmanship—as great as ever was made in British history in its career of emancipation, conciliation, and freedom—has increased the glory and stability of the Empire. The visit to India for the first time of her King and Queen to proclaim their Coronation, immediately after such proclamation in the different parts of the United Kingdom, heralded the dawn of a new era. King George will live in history

as the great Monarch who gave practical effect to the noble policy enunciated by his Royal Grandmother on assumption of sovereignty, and repeated by his Father on his accession. By their presence and anxiety for the welfare of all their subjects without distinction of race or creed King George and Queen Mary have allayed illegitimate unrest and agitation, assured a progressive administration, and promoted unity and concord among the different classes, races, and creeds whose disunion it has been the policy of reaction to foster. As heir to the Throne the King sent to India a message of sympathy ; as holder of the Imperial Crown he gave to India the watchword of hope—hope of sharing with his European subjects the duties, rights, and responsibilities of British citizenship by fusion of the culture of the East and the West. With the reign of King George begins India's hearty union with Britain.

Not the least of the benefits accruing to the Empire by the visit of their Majesties to India is the altered tone of the reactionary Press in Indian affairs. Time will show whether this change is the result of conviction or merely of apprehension of displeasure in high quarters. Considering the influence exercised by the Press in forming individual opinion, it is to be hoped that the European British Press of all shades will, without indulging in the fulsome adulation showered upon Colonials, see fit to display some consideration for the feelings of British Indians and other Asiatics. Towards the altered tone patriotic Britons would be disposed to exclaim *Esto perpetua*.

This book attempts to indicate how each partner can, without endangering her own ideals or sacrificing her own interests, help the other in advancing the welfare of the Empire, and how the connection of the most conservative as well as the most spiritual with the most progressive as well as the most sanely material of existing forces may result in the evolution of a humanly perfect State, with ideals, individual and national, which will be the beacon for mankind.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	
INTRODUCTION	21

Idealism the lever of progress—The ideal life, individual and national—Clash of moral forces and material interests—Impulses of the human mind, sane, insane, and worldly—Characterisation of the three types—Conditions of advance—Causes of opposition—Means of success, especially enlightened zeal of leaders—The two great antagonistic forces: Construction and Destruction, or Progression and Conservation—Idealism may be autocratic, but is unselfish—Is it impracticable?—Limitation by existent worldly conditions—Ebb and flow—Means to a permanent and sustained advance—Hopes for the future.

CHAPTER I

HINDRANCES	33
------------	----

The fabled Golden Age—The primitive mind as conceived by Aryan Sages—Original inclination to virtue or to vice—Hindrances to life's progress, (1) from without, (2) from within—Antagonisms to the ideal—External hindrance a test of constancy—Evil influences from primitive stages—Heredity and environment—Cautious estimate of hereditary influences—Success and merit—Birth, high and humble—The moral aspect of heredity—Public control of degenerates—Treatment of habitual crime—Operation of heredity, moral and physical—

Misconceptions on the question of heredity—Praiseworthy qualities attributed to birth—Opportunities denied to humble birth—Brains and birth—The rearing of children—Inherited tendencies—Mixed ancestors—Potency of association and training in forming character—Environment and responsibility—Self-importance—Self-ignorance—Discontent—Dividing influences—Family and national estrangement—Happy surroundings—Accidents and misunderstandings—Association, degrading or elevating—Inheritance of honours—Virtue retiring, vice forward—Lower and selfish instincts—The Tree of Ignorance, and its fruits—Effects of familiarity—Distrust—Shouldering pushfulness, and counter self-assertion—Offensive interferences—Espionage, social and international—Embitterment of human relationships—Differences (rather than agreements) emphasised—Religious animosity—Racial and class hostility—Worship of wealth, and of popularity—Impulsiveness—Family interests—Universal responsibility—Worship of self—Domination and subjection—Changing basis of organised society—Imperialism, its nature and policy—Its weak points—Its different forms (progressive or reactionary)—Inferior and backward races—Perversion of wealth—Conflicting class views—Abuse of opportunities—Superiors and inferiors—Increase of class hatred under democracy—Worship of material good—Hence pride—And mistaken heroism—And perverted penology—International justice—Independence—Self-regard—External interference with personal or national freedom of action—Law and order—Personal freedom (individualism)—Modern nationalism—Selfishness—Its encouragements and issues—Even the idealist has his selfishness—He fails to distinguish different types of mind—Pugnacious pushfulness, and suspicious caution—Wealth a social disintegrator—Indolent self-regard—Indifference of isolation—Moral wrongdoing not legally punishable—Little well-doing without hope of reward—Coercion to duty—Operation of selfishness : (1) Self-preservation ; (2) Self-aggrandisement ;

(3) Self-deception—Justifiable selfishness—Selfishness in misfortune—Development cramped—Hindrances, physical and mental—Attitude of the government—Irresponsible criticism—Conceit.

CHAPTER II

AIDS AND IDEALS

107

Opposition an incentive—Mutual forbearance and respect—The spread of culture—The quest of the ideal—Seekers of happiness, active and passive—Means to unselfish happiness—Ways of acquisition of knowledge—Incentives to conduct—Endeavour to be useful—High importance of vitality—Supports of strenuousness—Early education and training—Lines of development—Prolongation of vigour—Various effects of annoyance—Familiar intercourse—Differences of opinion—Criticism, fair and unfair—Importance of just criticism—Varying gravity of offences—Social legislation—Punishment and reformation—Virtues of sacrifice—Failure of religion to inspire generally a high sense of duty—Conflicting elements in human nature—Deviation from principle—Prophets of evil—The rearing of better citizens—Authority, its powers and qualifications—Efficiency through control—Dangers of selfishness—Importance of the point of view—Harmonisation of differing conditions—Unity fostered by sympathy—Patriotism, worldly or ideal—Patriotism, sane or not sane—Methods of securing international peace—The mischief of provocation—Mistaken selfishness—Fostering virtues—The virtuous self—Ways of dealing with evil : avoidance or resistance—Desirable companionship—Companionship of books—Trashy literature—Spread of ideas—Main influences on conduct—Three possible views of life—Means to lasting happiness : pure duty and sense of unity of life—Domination : virtuous, vicious, or worldly—Confused ideas of imperialism—Basis of a true imperialism—Nature of racial superiority—Advantages of struggle—

Necessity of control—Conditions of success of democratic institutions—Conflict of freedom and authority—Relation of rulers and ruled—Modern “independence”—Repression or indulgence?—Facing difficulties—Treatment of crime—The Sovereign and a privileged order—Democracy, fit and unfit—Republican institutions in France—and in the United States—Colonial self-government—Tendencies in Germany—No reversion to autocracy—Classes must regulate their interrelations—The best men must lead—Legislation must be such as to command respect—Invasion and conquest—Consequences of despotism—Financial resources—Principles of legitimate taxation—What is fair taxation?—The problem of poverty—Means of defence—Violation of physical or moral laws—Degrees of good and of evil—Fatalism, vacuous or virile—The happy home—State provision against results of bad parentage and environment—Paternal officialism—Cardinal points in child training—Elements of a good education—Character the ultimate aim—Indispensable means—“Give me neither poverty nor riches”—Security, individual and national—Defensive and offensive strength—Service, voluntary and compulsory—Diplomacy and double-dealing—Honour and honesty—Duty to one’s neighbour—Advancement relative—Virility no monopoly—Conflict of classes—Balance of power in the State—“Real aristocracy”—The workmen’s share—Constructive and destructive measures—Labour the basis of advancement—Social interdependence—True education—Equality of opportunity—Command of temper—Good manners—Food and drink—Housing and sanitation—Control of the appetites—Fundamental importance of continence—Essential unity of all social groups—The mind’s first training—The sphere of woman—Woman in various countries—The relationship of man and woman—Equality—Matrimony—Beauty—Conflict of desire and duty—Aspects of desire—Freedom of opinion—Personal services—Early discipline—The secret of health—Physical and moral conditions—Social

cohesion—Nationality—Humanitarianism—Reciprocal influences—Freedom—Wayward developments—The ups and the downs—The value of enthusiasm—Worship of Divinity—Desire of unity—Legislation and administration—Freedom and culture—Obedience based on respect—Dangers of domination—Effects of contact—Meekness—Intervention—The helping hand—Balance of forces—Steady and strenuous effort—Peaceful methods—Modes of social organisation—The policy of progress—Stages of life—The virile qualities.

CHAPTER III

GREAT BRITAIN

221

Unique position of Britain—English political institutions—System of government—Conflict of forces—Moral greatness—Industrial and commercial superiority—Reactionary school—Progressives and Conservatives—Nationalism and Imperialism—"Little-Englanders"—A rotten system—Unionism based on domination—The Peers—"Damn the consequences"—Aristocratic pearls of speech—Deterioration of the aristocracy—Methods depend on circumstances—Separatist tendencies—The British woman—Conversions to reaction—Colonial assertiveness—External defence—Security from invasion—Foreign alliances and ententes—Expenditure on armaments—Universal military training—World Empire—British "Empire" a misnomer (except as regards India)—Colour discrimination—Taxation—Income Tax—Necessaries and luxuries—Social problems—The drink question—The population question—Emigration—Marriage—Nursing of children—The servant question—Social discontents—Capital and Labour—Selfishness of Capital—Aggressiveness of labour—Policy of conciliation—Spurious "independence" of working classes—American influences—Pressing dangers—Foreign competition in trade—The Metropolis of the Empire—Attractions of London—

Problems of London—Destitution and pauperism—Overcrowding and housing—Local co-operation—The problem of education—Class selfishness—Recrudescence of savagery—Veneer of civilisation—Majority rule—Parliamentary waste of time—Suspicion and rudeness—Reform and reaction—An evergreen Empire—The glory of Britain.

CHAPTER IV

INDIA 275

Contrast of India with Britain—India awaking from long sleep—A moral plague-spot—Indian boycott of the foreigner a mistake—Undeserved contempt—Ignorance of English public men—Consequent perverted action—Duty of English leaders—Strong officials required in India—Virulence of reaction—The influence of the Press—Advocates of silence—Dangers ahead—Self-government for India?—"British" rule—Rather "Anglo-Asiatic" rule—Delhi, the new capital—Criticism of officials—Enemies of progress—Growth of Indian patriotism—Unmannerliness and jealousy—The higher castes and their responsibility—Liberal administration impracticable—Lack of resources—Selfishness—Priestcraft—Evil customs and traditions—Early marriage—Ancient Aryan idea of matrimony changed—Seclusion of women—Remarriage of widows—The tyranny of caste—Need and method of social reform—The tyranny of complexion—Social change—Hopes from history—Opposition of ignorance—Need of a progressive political *régime*—Training for fitness—Experiments and safeguards—Mischievousness of the reactionary press—Official domineering—How to perfect the system of government—The failure of natural leaders—Indian representations in Parliament—Aspirations of Bengal—The Babu—Democracy as yet unsuited to India—Differential financial treatment—British and Indian interests identical—Aristocratic forms with

popular sympathies—Racial or other partiality suicidal—Misguided policy of a recent Viceroy—False position of the “Emperor”—Spread of anarchism—Extremists not anarchists—The people solid for law and order—Freedom the cure for anarchism—Hypocritical “loyalty”—Co-operation of people and police—Justice before racial domination—Disaffection and sedition—India should form an integral part of the Empire—Hindrances to union—Government by foreigners—Difficulties of union—Waiting for the Deliverer—The task before Asia—India’s influence on British politics and society—The Sovereign should govern as well as reign—“Strong” government—Decline of manners—India’s turn next—New times call for new methods—Social transformations—The old order of governing body and the new—India must cultivate her own traditions and resources—Foundation of Indian Home Rule—Financial security—Military administration wasteful—Heavy Budget—Grievous ignorance of the people—Democracy and oligarchy—Selection of representatives—The duty of Indians—Division among leaders—Disparagement of leaders—The controversy is political—Privileged classes—Commercial preference—Police injustice—Misplaced blame for police wrongdoing—Laxity of superiors—Self-defence—Indian Civil Service—Discrimination against Indians—New positions opened to Indians—Indians on the Judicial Bench—The open door—Relation of the Government of India to the Home Government—Social amity—Educational discouragement—Tests of fitness—Worship of Mammon—Differential salaries—Opportune Liberal Government—Liberal European Indian officials retired—Clash of progressive and reactionary tendencies—Equality or opportunity—Moving with the times—Effects of Colonial action on India—Economic factors—Need of discipline—Modified despotism—Sanitary measures—Social needs—Centralisation undesirable—India’s grievances enumerated—The religious problem—The rise of priestcraft—Religious antipathy fomented—The taunt of

idolatry and superstition—Hindrances to reform—
National incubuses—Ancient Aryan culture—Aryan
religious development—Aryan thought—Self-sacrifice—
The duty of Indian Aryans—Problems of British Indian
statesmanship—Indian pride in British citizenship—
The British connection—"The Brightest Jewel"—
The consummation.

INTRODUCTION

IN all ages and climes an ideal state has been aimed at by the more advanced and cultured portions of mankind, for the active enlistment of human energies and for the uplifting of the standard of existence. Every department of life and every school of culture has its enthusiasts, who strive to gain ends that are deemed unpractical by the mass of their fellows. Yet, if these idealists and enthusiasts did not exist, nothing in Art, Science, and human institutions could attain development beyond the stage known at a particular time. Human nature, owing to its timidity in the face of risks, is so attached to things to which it is born or bred, so adverse to change in thoughts and acts (which cautious and ease-loving minds decry as revolution), that progress in moral and material ideas appears to be impossible, unless at every stage a few, endowed by divine light within and nurtured by fortunate teachers and associates, sound the bugle for advance towards the goal that gifted vision alone enables them to perceive as attainable by and for man.

The ideal life concerns man both in his personal and in his collective capacity, and has to be considered in its individual and in its national phases. These involve the various departments of which human life is composed. Each has its work to do and its part to play in life. As human affairs have hitherto, in spite of great idealist teachers, been moulded, the well-being of one individual appears to clash with the well-being of others—one cannot gain what one seeks without depriving a fellow-creature of what he also either possesses or

seeks. On the broader field of national existence the antagonism of interests is still more forcibly displayed. In the domain of culture and in the active energy of the mind to discover new truths, to invent new ideas, and to advance human welfare, the antagonism does not and, fortunately for man, cannot exist ; but in all material concerns advancement in either individual or national interests seems possible only at the expense of others.

While, therefore, moral forces are always striving for just and generous treatment of human affairs, material considerations stand in the way of the attainment of the ideal in life. It is an exemplification of the great truth, as applied to individual existence, "the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." In worldly affairs spirit alone cannot be attended to at the sacrifice of matter. Being twins joined by indissoluble bonds for the purposes of a worldly career, the sacrifice or the predominance of one issues in the dissolution of both. If the two can be maintained in harmony, if the forces represented by each can be evenly balanced with those of the other, if each refuses to flourish or to decay, to advance or to recede, without the constant companionship of its mate, existence for every nation and for every individual would invariably lead towards the ideal. But, nature being a struggle of forces, morality clashes with interest, evil fights with good, and each force that by its balance of matter and mind becomes dominant attempts to control or subjugate the material existence of its fellows, and in so doing neglects moral considerations. Such neglect causes the loss of its own balance and undermines its own strength and existence. Mankind *as a whole* has never yet attempted to contend with evil in the moral or in the material sphere in order to secure its complete extinction ; the aim has been only towards the removal of what appears for the moment inconvenient or inimical to some particular idea of happiness. Success generates intoxication and conceit ; failure causes subjugation and decay.

The impulses and motives that lead the human mind to thought and action may be divided into three categories: sane, insane, and worldly. The impulses are sane when the mind is trained to virtue and is incapable of doing anything that may savour of wrong. They are insane when the mind is subject to the domination of the physical self, constituting this the pivot of existence, for whose benefit and pleasure everything and everybody else is made. The impulses are worldly—that is, a mixture of sanity and insanity—when the mind is sufficiently enlightened to perceive its own interest in not wishing to have a monopoly and yet not virtuous enough to discard all thought of selfish enjoyment.

The insane type is the source of all the miseries of life. The worldly type has the potentiality of advancing to sanity, but is held back by the activities of the insane. The sane type is the cause of virility and progress in every department of life. It is quite possible for the sane type to deteriorate to the worldly, and even to the insane, by constant and prolonged association, just as it is possible for the insane and the worldly to advance under similar association with the sane. Individual as well as national advancement or degradation depends upon the nature of the association or influence that comes to guide its existence.

It is possible to conceive of a state of things in which all races of men, all nations, all families, and all individuals will be equally cultured, equally just, equally generous, equally considerate. That state can be attained only if such individuals, nations, and races as are for a time placed in the fortunate position of being able to mould the destinies of their brethren are disposed, like the most gifted and unselfish teachers, to make it their mission in life to bestow on their backward neighbours, pupils, and juniors the highest and best of what they possess and are able to impart, with the single aim of making the noblest moral principles and the most desirable physical conditions the common property of mankind. From

the more timid and lethargic minds, who deem any change a nuisance and fraught with risks, opposition and even active resistance may be expected. The wicked type would only try to secure temporary selfish advantage from such charity and generosity.

Until all individuals attain a high standard of excellence the generosity and the teaching of the gifted few may be abused by individuals and nations whose association and breeding have not been of the best type, and who are by habit incapable of being convinced of the unselfish motives of their teachers and exemplars. Among those intended to be benefited by better moral and material conditions there may be some who are, by nature or by evil traditions of past ages or by undesirable association, unworthy of the noblest teaching, and on whom the employment of time and labour may be deemed to be wasted. There are others who, with the caution and timidity characteristic of the mass of mankind, may hesitate to accept new methods or to adopt new ideas unless they find their neighbours moving in that direction. There are still others whose knowledge of good and evil is perhaps not less than that of their gifted brethren, but who are so blinded by self-interest or by the desire to continue the state of things that gives to them, or to the class or race in which they are born or whose temporal interests they advocate, a preponderating influence and importance over their fellows and neighbours, that they have, or pretend to have, persuaded themselves that the existing order, changed as it has been from time to time, in spite of the opposition of such as themselves, is necessary for the security and welfare of society.

These are the usual conditions with which reformers and idealists in every department of life have had in the past, and will have in the future, to contend. Opposition of that kind has often retarded, and it continues to retard, the speedy attainment by man of an ideal existence. But the continu-

ance and ultimate success of the struggle between light and darkness, between progress and decay, between the interests of a few and the welfare of mankind, depend not upon the resistance of the advocates of stagnation, but upon the zeal and enthusiasm of the leaders of idealism. As in a military campaign a capable commander, in spite of timid or hesitating advice of his council of war, may deem it necessary to make an advance that may be momentous in deciding the issue, and as his success or failure may depend upon the enthusiasm and loyalty that he can inspire into his army, so in other departments of life the success of a leader depends upon the confidence that he can inspire and the devotion of which his associates and followers are capable. Opposition and resistance, especially from self-interest, advance a great cause by inquiry, discussion, and persuasion. Triumph secured by force may be momentarily pleasant, but cannot be productive of permanent good.

In the history of mankind, in any generation or age, idealists have always been few. Consumed by the fire of their unselfish enthusiasm, and impelled by purity of motive, they have never thought of slackening their zeal in order to inquire whether the inert mass of their fellows whose advancement and welfare they seek are able to grasp their ideas and disposed to budge from the even tenor of their traditional ways. While the originators of new ideas have generally assumed an uncompromising attitude, some of the first acceptors of such ideas, when placed by favourable circumstances in positions of authority, have, with the view to push their principles step by step and to disarm opposition, tried to carry out as much as can be made acceptable to a considerable number. This may be considered a prudent and practical method and better than to have nothing at all, but it has the disadvantage of cooling enthusiasm among the more ardent advocates to whom the notion of conciliating ignorance or interested opposition appears objectionable. Any

concession to evil has the further drawback of leading people to doubt the sincerity of the reforming force. Idealism, like perfection, can have but one standard—its full and unalloyed self. Any mixture, however small, debases it to its unhallowed environment. For the advancement of temporary good, and to enable the undeveloped brain or untrained stomach to digest unaccustomed diet, it is often necessary to administer mixtures. Without dilution the brain or stomach may not succeed in retaining the food, much less in assimilating it. Without capacity of retention and subsequent assimilation the most desirable food cannot be taken and utilised. Good physicians and teachers present it in such weak or diluted doses as the recipient can retain and assimilate. In this, as in all worldly affairs, caution may be carried too far, so as to retard development when circumstances are favourable, while rashness may cause an aggravation of ailment and a stoppage of growth altogether. A line has to be drawn somewhere, and wisdom lies in being neither rash nor too cautious and in taking note of capacity and circumstances with an unfaltering purpose to gain the ultimate end without being daunted by difficulties.

In human affairs, while the inert mass is always satisfied with leading its dull prosaic existence, and does not wish to run risks or to cherish adventurous ambitions, it is in every disciplined and organised society always ready to be guided by those who may attain the position of leaders, and on whom the generality may feel disposed to rely. In the guidance of mankind two forces are at work in varying degrees of strength; and progress or retrogression results from the strength or the weakness of the dominating force for the time being. It is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the causes that lead to retrogression, when man's aim in life is apparently to improve his material and moral condition. Retrogression can take place only when there is complacency (that is, no desire for further progress), and its inevitable result, stagnation.

The motive that leads an over-cautious physician or teacher to prescribe what may be weaker than the retentive capacity of the patient or pupil may explain to a certain extent the stoppage of growth ; and stoppage of growth is bound to cause stagnation and decay. Self-interest, or the desire to monopolise the moral or material possessions somehow secured, and disinclination to share with fellow-beings what is a source of personal happiness—these often stand in the way of human progress. To cope with such selfishness a protesting force has at times shown itself in greater or less strength, and owing to the nature of the struggle has often attempted to subdue its enemy by drastic methods that have not appealed to the sober and peaceful instincts of ordinary minds.

The two great antagonistic forces that are ever at work under various names in different conditions to make or to mar human happiness may be denominated Construction and Destruction, or Progression and Conservation. Some progressive forces are in their nature destructive, since good cannot be achieved without destroying the evil that flourishes—that has got ingrained in the mind and become its second nature. When a progressive force is destructive, it bears within itself the seed of construction ; but a conservative force cannot be constructive, because its operation is to maintain things as they are, and any departure from existing conditions destroys its conservative character and turns it into a constructive force. A conservative force, therefore, is really destructive, although it strives unconsciously or deliberately to cloak its ultimate end with a professed anxiety to avoid evil. In this respect a conservative force, being slow and silent in its method and action, is indeed more dangerous than an open and violently destructive force, for while it is easy to cope with open violence it is difficult to guard against evil that is insidiously caused by enemies in the garb of friends. It is possible for a conservative force to be, like a too cautious physician or teacher, timid in favouring advance, but unless it is absolutely opposed to change.

it becomes a progressive force differentiated in degree but not in kind. Conservation in individual as well as in national life has to be avoided in order to guard against stagnation and decay, and in order to give fair play to those sublime faculties of conception and construction with which omniparous Nature has endowed her creation. As in militarism the way to keep the machine efficient and to render it perfect is to see that every part is carefully guarded against neglect, that every device to improve it is given a fair trial and is incorporated when found useful, and that every point in the preparations of a possible enemy is noted and provided for, so in the march towards idealism and its ultimate attainment, whether individual or national, every possible drawback has to be considered and provided for, complaisance and consequent lethargy have to be avoided, the attacks in flank as well as in front and rear have to be repelled, and a steady progress has to be maintained towards the desired goal. Ceaseless vigilance is the price not only of freedom in every department of life but also of the ideal existence which transforms individuals and nations from brutality to divinity.

The two great forces, or sets of forces, which thus govern and mould human conduct and destiny are mutually antagonistic : one unifying, the other disintegrating ; one promoting fraternity, the other nursing enmity ; one trying to destroy or retard what the other attempts to construct and advance. It is, therefore, obvious that in proportion as one is controlled the other becomes stronger ; and the more the constructive and virile force triumphs over its destructive enemy the more successful becomes the march of individuals and nations towards happiness and usefulness. Ardent combatants exist in each camp, both sides being perhaps equally confident of success in securing human happiness. One side is optimistic, the other pessimistic ; one believes in advancing the interests of a few as necessary for the happiness of all, the other is convinced that attention to a part cannot secure the welfare of the whole ;

one despairs of making every fellow-being good and dutiful, the other is persuaded that no progress can be made except by a general advance; one deems the imperfections of human nature to be irremediable, the other is confident of making it divine; one wishes to advance happiness by love, the other by coercion and suspicion. Love may sometimes, or perhaps often, be misplaced, but the object will be found, on impartial examination, to be a victim of defective training and evil association rather than an embodiment of the innate wickedness of human nature. Unless, however, the advance of mankind along the right lines towards the desired goal is declared to be a mistake, it will be readily admitted even by the pessimists that love, and not hatred, can alone bring about a happier relationship between man and man.

Idealism, like despotism, may be apt to be autocratic and inconsiderate. The difference lies in the guiding motive. Despotism when benevolent may be beneficent, but owing to the nature and tendencies of the mind cannot help developing complacency and selfishness, and aiming at retention of power whatever the effect of such power may be on others. It has the further disadvantage of drifting into hands in which the moral fibre is not very strong. Idealism in its impatience to remove evil and to make good prevail may appear autocratic, but it is absolutely devoid of selfishness and can never have any personal interests to serve.

Idealism is placed by some in contrast with Realism, and held to be impracticable. As a matter of fact, idealism is real and practical, and is opposed only to worldliness—to the necessities of an ephemeral and shortsighted existence. Life is useless and void if it seeks only traditional pleasures during the short span of its existence. This seeking is the inevitable result of ignorance and worldliness—ignorance, which cannot comprehend the unity of existence without limitation of time, and which does not recognise responsibility to associates and successors; worldliness, which deems the escape of a frail and

finite being from temporary sorrows and troubles, and the enjoyment of present ease, to be the highest aim and ambition of life.

In advocating and developing ideal life, it is not possible or desirable to ignore worldly conditions. Human society has to be dealt with according to what it has been in the past, what it is in the present, and what it is likely to be for a long time to come. One cannot be blind to the heritage of evil that has accompanied the great heritage of good from the past ages. It is impossible to overlook the demoralising and often degrading selfishness that characterises a large number of people—people who, although possessing enough culture to comprehend the nature of birth, existence, development, and death, individual and national, are bent day after day throughout their mundane career on hoodwinking and harrying their fellows in order to rob them of something that may make their own lives momentarily more pleasant and agreeable. This desire for the unhallowed possession of ease and luxury at the expense of others lies at the root of human misery.

If the desire is fully satisfied, it produces conceit and lethargy; and if it is not accomplished, it causes a fresh development of selfishness and generates bitterness and animosity intensifying the struggle between man and man, and between one nation and another. How to cope effectively with existing evils, so as to diminish them in order that human happiness may be advanced, is a problem that has occupied the best minds from immemorial time. While one generation specially gifted in one locality has secured an advance, another generation in the same locality has set back the clock. Human effort, even in such a vital matter as the advancement of happiness and the triumph of good over evil, has been too selfish to deserve or to secure success. It is not by the enlightenment and happiness of a few individuals or a few families or certain classes or a group in a particular locality, while all around remain in darkness and ignorance, that the

advanced posts towards the goal will be permanently secured. By the law of nature the contact with the ignorant and unsophisticated and weaker antagonists introduces the leaven by which the virtues of the attacking force become dull and sluggish, with the result that it has either to fall back on its old position or else is merged and lost in the inert mass of its enemies. The only way to secure a permanent and sustained advance is not to limit efforts and sympathies to particular localities, groups, classes, families, or individuals, not to ignore the vast mass of groping humanity as beyond the scope of national care, not to attempt advance in one quarter and to recede in another, but to make a general advance all along the line without distinction of place, or person, class, or race, keeping steadfastly in view the light which must uniformly shine for all mankind, or which otherwise by occasional and fitful appearance will leave mankind in deeper and more general gloom.

The enemies of human advancement and happiness, the embodiment of greed and selfishness, the advocates of monopoly and privilege, are still too strongly entrenched for the champions of light and right, few as they are, to make a successful assault on the citadel of ignorance and reaction. But every day the circumstances are getting more and more favourable for assault. Selfishness thrives, animosity is cherished, dislike is engendered when interests are supposed to clash, and when the relationship of contending forces is unknown. Like father and son, or brother and sister, long separated, accidentally meeting without introduction or mutual recognition, and treating each other like strangers, or even like enemies should occasion arise for conflict, the various groups of the human family, separated by barriers, sometimes natural and at other times artificial, have come to regard each other as natural enemies whose first duty for the sake of self-preservation is to destroy each other or at least to make each other impotent in guiding and moulding human destiny. General

enlightenment without distinction of class, locality, race, or creed, and the onward march of Science are daily weakening the attitude of suspicion and antagonism in which each group has hitherto deemed its safety to lie. Ignorance of each other and consequent misunderstanding appear to be giving way to mutual regard and confidence. A simultaneous movement on the part of progressive forces in every land and organised reliance on mutual help are alone now needed to confound everywhere the reactionary army and to secure its surrender.

HINDRANCES

A Study in Ideals : Great Britain and India

CHAPTER I

HINDRANCES

AMONG the Ancients the impression appears to have been general that human society commenced with a Golden Age ; or, as the Aryans of India called it, Satya Yuga—the Age of Truth and Virtue. The impression, bordering on conviction, was based on experience, which seemed to indicate that in the primitive stage of the mind innocence usually prevailed, but that in contact with others the mind developed undesirable attributes. The impression or belief could not be correct if in the proverbial Golden Age there were minds to which innocence was unknown, by which virtue was not valued for its own sake, and which conceived the idea of benefiting themselves at the expense of others. The Age could scarcely be called Golden if then, as now and as in the intervening space of time, virtue and vice, happiness and misery, existed simultaneously and continued to flourish side by side. Satan could not have come into this planet except as a created being ; and the object of the Creator in devising evil could be only to prove to mankind the intrinsic value and necessity of virtue, by placing in juxtaposition its contrast and

by showing the alternative to goodness to be suffering due to subjection to evil.

In later thought the notion prevailed that the mind at its primitive stage is crude and ignorant, and is perhaps more conversant with or susceptible to evil than good, but that in course of evolution it advances to the stage of virtue, as it advances towards light in all departments of life. In the limitless field of knowledge, the mind by persistent effort gets Nature's beauties, creations, and secrets gradually unfolded to its view, but observation and experience do not substantiate either theory—that as it advances it falls away from virtue or becomes more virtuous. The Aryan notion, unlike the Christian doctrine of original sin, is that the mind comes into being as a white sheet, or clean slate, that the faculty of conception with which it is endowed is responsible for the birth of evil as well as of good, and that, as one armed with a knife or gun feels naturally disposed to test its efficacy, the mind wishes to exercise its faculties both for good and evil. In the exercise of its freedom, more as a diversion than of set purpose, the mind thinks of change, and, being always anxious to do something or to move out of a stagnant state, directs its course either towards virtue or towards vice, as may suit its temperament for the time being, or as its immediate worldly interests prompt, or as its associates induce it to follow. An Aryan Sage has laid down the maxim :—

“*Mana eva manushyánám káranam bandha mokshayoh.*”
(Mind is the cause of the bondage or freedom of human beings.)

The poet Spenser, as well as other Occidental Sages, has corroborated the notion in identical language :—

“It is the mind that maketh good or ill,
That maketh wretch or happie, rich or poore.”

If mind is the cause of its own freedom or bondage, of its

own happiness or wretchedness, it appears strange that it should ever deliberately choose the path of evil and misery and avoid the path of good and happiness. The only possible explanation is that the mind has not the prescience to discern which course will lead to good, and that its choice either is a game of chance or is made simply to enable the evil to live, since the extinction of evil would take away the incentive to the struggle between virtue and vice or vacuity, upon which existence and its happiness so much depend. More important than the attainment of happiness is the struggle to secure and retain it, because this brings out and develops the finest qualities of the mind; because the greater the effort needed to gain an object the more is it valued; and because, once secured beyond all possible risks, the greatest worldly happiness would pall after a time, and life would be aimless unless the risk of loss necessitated continuous watchfulness and struggle. Worldly good fortune, such as wealth or honour, calls for prudence to guard against loss, and among fortune-seekers opinion is equally divided as to which is the greater pleasure—to acquire it or to retain it. Human society generally shows its appreciation of wealth and honour at least as much when they are inherited as when they are acquired, which proves that the capacity of retention is valued quite as much as the capacity of acquisition. Ideal happiness, once secured and placed on a firm basis, has to fear no injury or loss, since it is not connected with variable phases of matter or of the outer world; and any injury to it or loss of it can be caused only by the mind itself, which then, as in case of suicide, loses its reason and becomes insane.

Hindrances of life's progress, when the mind in its crude and undeveloped state or after coming in contact with both good and evil decides upon an advance towards happiness, are met with at every step. They proceed from two great sources, one springing from outside and the other from within. From the first source come those immemorial traditions, handed down from generation to generation, which record the

struggle that human virility has had to wage in order to subdue and to keep under control the forces that attempt to stand in the way. A struggle, however just and successful, cannot but leave behind it some evil. The undesirable traditions and teachings of human history—its bloodshed, murders, massacres, plunders, robberies, tortures, tyrannies, and wars—can never be wiped from memory, and the consequent possible disposition of the mind to taste the nature of evil and to let the passions generated or awakened by its knowledge run uncontrolled at times will always exist. The poison appears to be ineradicable, unless the human mind were to begin its career again with a clean sheet; and, so long as the seed of poison lurks in the system, it is bound to try to assert its power and to lead the mind away from its desired goal when the virile faculties are at ease or in slumber.

From the other source spring the hindrances that result from the abnormal development of self and of the faculty of conception along the lines most inimical to human welfare. It is the instinct, or the nebulous potentialities, for good or evil with which every mind appears to take its birth and to feel its separate existence throughout its worldly career, owing to its inseparable connection with matter. This source, as it lies within, is not beyond one's control, and good and great minds in all ages and climes prove that suitable training, wide observation, and a perception of the unity and purity of the essence out of which every human entity springs may remove this great hindrance out of the way. The opportunities, however, for such training and observation are rare, and owing to the strength of the antagonistic current mainly flowing from the first source the happiness of surmounting the obstacle can be enjoyed only by a very limited number of strenuous souls, whose achievement cannot be generally known or have much influence in moulding human conduct.

The evil traditions, teaching, and instincts with which idealism has to contend are thus many and various. In indi-

vidual, as in corporate national, life they may be divided into several groups. In one group come those that arise from apathetic or antipathetic fellow-creatures; and, in the case of nations, from rival nationalities, whose idea of happiness consists in trying to snatch something that others possess. In a second group may be placed such as may be attributed to "bad luck." Anything which from ignorance it is difficult to explain or account for, or for which one cannot hold another responsible, or which from vanity one does not feel disposed to attribute to one's own self, has to be classed in the category of "bad luck." In a third group may be included all the adverse forces which proceed from one's own self, and which in the exercise of one's free will one deliberately encourages, or for the consequences of which one does not hesitate to take the praise or blame. In a fourth group are those sufferings that result from a combination of adverse forces partly within and partly outside; such as physical maladies and mental worries. There are also some hindrances that cannot easily be assigned to one or other of the groups named—hindrances that are so mixed that they may be included in more than one of the groups.

Whatever may be the nature of the hindrance or whatever difficulty one may find in explaining it, the unprejudiced inquirer will find that, when it does not proceed from one's own self, it is but a test of one's constancy or capacity to surmount difficulties. In the case of physical ailments, which generally proceed from one's own non-observance of nature's laws, or continuous carelessness due to pride in one's own powers, recovery depends upon vitality to resist and conquer the attacking germ of disease or upon the scientific and experienced care that destiny may bring to the help of nature. In like manner, every hindrance in the path of happiness is removable when the mind has the quality or the strength to surmount it, or when it gets a suitable teacher or companion to influence it for good. When the qualification by previous

preparation or effort is wanting, but the resolution to conquer exists, the hindrance yields to the virility of the contending personality added to the forces that come to its help from unexpected quarters—forces that superstitious persons may call divine, and pride may designate as the triumph of the will.

Among the most potent of the hindrances in the path of ideal happiness are the incrustations of evil created by the mind in its primitive stages when the influence of ignorance, intolerance, impatience, and nervousness was supreme in human conduct. Whether they came into being with the passions and impulses of nature uncontrolled by reason, as symbolised by Cain in Occidental Scriptures and by demons in Oriental mythology, they established their dominion on such a firm footing that the attempts of the wisest, the bravest, and the most humane minds for thousands of years have not succeeded in undermining their unholy sway. Like prickly or poisonous plants and weeds, they appear to thrive on every soil, and a gardener of the most experienced and far-seeing type can alone discern their dangerous character and eradicate them so as to give fair play to the more desirable seedlings. Without constant watchfulness and care their appearance at times cannot be prevented; and, when one may be congratulating oneself on having extirpated them, a shoot may start forth in an unexpected quarter, and sometimes from causes beyond one's control. Their appearance at times even on the best cultivated soil, after years of virile effort to kill them, proves that, like the evil instincts of the human mind or the ailments connected with physical nature, they cannot be extinguished, but can only be kept under control so long as one is physically and morally wide awake and watchful in the observance of laws enacted by Providence to lead mankind to a happy existence. Even after constant and continued observation of the mind in its various phases from infancy to age, it is not easy to discover if the moral hindrances to advancement are all the products of the mind from within or are all the results of external in-

fluences. The conclusion can be based only on an assumption, according to one's disposition, as to the character of the mind before its contact with others—that is, by nature, either brutal or divine, or else merely human, which means a mixture of brutality and potential divinity.

According to one theory human nature is composed of instincts, and one is found to be virtuous or vicious or indifferent owing to what is in one's blood or brain, that is, inherited from ancestors. With the disposition of the mind to explain away matters and solve to its own satisfaction problems that are beyond its ken, and with its supreme faculty of artificial generalisation, it often rushes to conclusions from a few isolated instances and deliberately ignores other instances which contradict its conclusions. Observation does not substantiate the existence of instincts based on heredity alone. There may be, and probably is, in every system a greater or less disposition to contract or to assimilate good or evil, moral and physical; but, if one's nature were wholly based on heredity, an individual must always have progenitors and descendants of the same mental calibre and physical nature, and a nation would always be great or small, strong or weak, without any chance of rise or fall. In individuals, as well as nations, greatness or littleness is a process of growth accelerated or hindered by circumstances. The germs of good and evil, of virtue and vice, of courage and cowardice, as of muscular development, exist in every individual and in every nation. The germ that receives from infancy the most cultivation and the greatest encouragement thrives best. It is asserted that infants are often found with particular tendencies towards evil or good. If this be so, and if an infant from the moment it opened its senses to external environment received no encouragement from its associates for its particular innate tendency, it would be one of the mysteries that are beyond the power of mortals to solve. If an infant were withdrawn from undesirable and unhealthy surroundings

immediately after its birth, and kept aloof from evil association until youth, or until formation of character, it would probably be found, in spite of any weak points in its parentage, to develop and to display those qualities of human nature to which it had been trained. No creature is blameable for birth in unhappy environments, or is deserving of applause for birth under favourable conditions, unless the ancient Aryan notion that birth is regulated as a reward or punishment for the wilful acts of a previous existence be admitted to be correct. Every human brain is a receptacle of potential germs, and that germ is most developed which by accident, luck, or other inexplicable cause receives the greatest nourishment. It is conceivable that an evil germ in an individual has a greater potentiality of development than a good one, and *vice versa*, in the same way as physical development may be limited to a certain point ; but the responsibility for the encouragement of the evil germ must rest, not with its possessor until attainment of the age of discretion, but with those that have the power to mould or destroy it and fail to counteract its growth by careful nursing of its virtuous associates.

A mistaken idea of the principle of heredity is, like intolerance and prejudice, a great hindrance to the advancement of man. The modes of its operation and the extent of its influence have as yet only been begun to be explored ; so that, while the general doctrine may be manifestly important, it seems unwise to outrun the positive conclusions of scientific investigation. How far the doctrine may be able to help or to hinder human development is a problem of the future. But a loose, unqualified acceptance of it appears often to lead to a sort of fatalism, which retards human effort, and, in the case of those favoured by fortune, to the abuse of power and to demoralisation. The germs that the practical principles of heredity would foster or suppress are found in all grades of society ; and it would be wholly wrong to suppose that the existing social order reflects the scientific distinction of

inherited qualities or powers. Accordingly, when it is seen that men of the humbler social ranks, without any other adventitious help than perhaps wise parentage or capable guardianship, not unfrequently force themselves, by the virile exercise of their faculties, into the front ranks in every department of life, this fact ought to inspire hope and courage, and to banish the promptings of fatalism. The ignoble tendency to treat with contempt those that are down and to worship as heroes those that are lucky is, on the one hand, a cause of obstruction to advancement, and, on the other hand, a cause of degeneracy.

Admiration of success is an incentive to effort, but those that by personal energy or merit achieve success would be the last to wish for its worship, although prominence among fellow-mortals and a position of authority and power are often necessary for individuals and nations that wish to serve the cause of progress and to be the instruments in leading mankind towards happiness. In human affairs, in order to induce others to follow a particular course of action or abstention, one must command respect, which is readily accorded to position secured either by personal merit or by the power of inflicting punishment for disobedience. Prominence based on a general conviction of unselfish advocacy is the most potent for good. If, however, position and power generate self-complacency and are not used for the benefit of others, not only are they useless but they also demoralise their possessor. Power to inspire fear, or any sort of physical strength, if not combined with a cool head, a kind heart, and a sense of responsibility, degenerates into tyranny, which excites the passion for vengeance and leads to a duel between the tyrant and the oppressed. A duel of the kind, unless tyranny succumbs, further aggravates the miseries of mankind.

In individuals the advantages of birth and of desirable parentage are not always noticeable. The issue of handsome men and pretty women are not always physically handsome or

pretty. The children of great, clever, or successful persons do not often exhibit the same qualities, although such children in the present stage of human society certainly possess a better chance in life than those born under adverse conditions. They have, however, to labour under certain drawbacks, and are bound by conventions from which the humble-born are free. The conventions and drawbacks often mar their development from childhood, and only such as succeed, under suitable guardians and teachers or with virile instincts, in rising above conventions and in resisting drawbacks, derive full advantage from their comparatively favourable nativity. On the other hand, in the case of persons born in the struggling grades of life, while they lack the advantages resulting from birth and affluence, they are at the same time free from the bondage of family traditions and social conventions, and are so far able to devote all their energies to the pursuit of the ideals of their life. They have the additional advantage of being able to learn without any derogation of dignity from the example, experience, and trials of their favourably placed brethren, who on their part too often refuse to stoop to learn even important truths from fellow-men of a "lower" social scale.

While the physical aspect of heredity, so far as adequately verified by science, is necessarily not to be ignored, great stress must be laid upon its moral aspect; and this again is closely related to the physical basis of the doctrine. As has been observed, the principle breaks through the existing social grades: it withers the conceit that prides itself on the accident of "high" birth, and it reproves depression of spirit for the accident of "low" birth. The advancement of happiness is retarded and often thwarted, and gains of mankind on the road to happiness are often lost, by the suspicion, the want of consideration, and the contempt for humbler mortals generated in minds intoxicated by "superior" birth or by "success" in life. Where a person that is favourably situated uses his position in

life to encourage inhuman feelings or selfish traditions that divide man from man, or to intensify and perpetuate animosities and suspicions, he must be condemned as an enemy of progress and of mankind. The doctrine of heredity, so far as it goes, and so far as it may go, cannot but impress a larger and more serious sense of parental responsibility and establish personal merit more firmly upon a basis totally different from the existing social distinctions of birth. It will also lead to a clearer and more definite perception of the immutable principles of cause and effect that guide mankind steadily towards beatitude.

While those that are born in favourable positions sometimes fail to come up to the mark expected of them from their superior rank, the unfortunate consequences of birth under unfavourable conditions are but too often exhibited in physical malady and in moral degeneracy. There are certain maladies and physical deformities that are in their nature apt to be communicated by sufferers to their children; lunacy and certain forms of mental weakness are prominent examples. Organised society in some lands tries to control and to prevent the communication and continuance of some of the forms. Such persons as bring upon themselves physical maladies and moral degeneracy by deliberate or thoughtless acts of their own approximate the position of suicides, and ought, in distinctly serious cases, to be controlled by public official action. Such persons as consciously and wilfully communicate any serious physical ailment or moral weakness to associates or to progeny ought, so far as is practicable, to be similarly restrained and punished. Such communication may take place thoughtlessly, but, whether thoughtless or deliberate, it continues human suffering and stands in the way of human happiness; and it is the duty of the State, within practicable limits, to control and to eradicate the evil, just as it recognises the duty of taking measures to prevent the commission of offences against person and property. In the case of those that are innocent sufferers

by the commission or omission of others, a gentler treatment is necessary, so that the sense of justice may not be blunted. They should be segregated and well treated, but for their own sake, as well as for the sake of mankind, they must be prevented from communicating the infection.

Habitual crime comes under the category. It could be stopped, not merely by punishment, but also by strict segregation, and by preventing contamination of others by the publication of harrowing details. It is believed by many of those whose business gives them experience in the administration of law and justice that publication of cases and the punishment awarded deter many evil-disposed minds from doing wrong. This view is founded in the widely held belief that crime is in the nature of man since the day when Cain, without either bad example or bad teaching, took it into his head to murder his brother, and that the fear of punishment alone prevents people from slaying and robbing each other. Society has so far in every age and clime been so constituted as to substantiate the correctness of the view. It is assumed that the aim of every stranger is to rob or deprive one of something that one values and would not willingly part with. The idea of the inherent and general wickedness of human nature is based on very superficial knowledge ; on deeper thought and observation, it would probably be found to spring from the weakness of the average mind generalising from a few isolated instances and finding worldly safety not in a generous trust in fellow-men, not in influencing them by love, but in habitual suspicion of them and in the promptings of fear.

Publication of crime, its forms and details, habituates and hardens minds that are disposed to evil, while it may often provide an incentive to innocent minds to think of paths that they would otherwise never have known. It is doubtless a proof of strength to be able to resist temptations, but knowledge of evil will be found more to produce suffering than to serve as a test of strength. Although there are *physical* defects

and ailments that may be inherited as well as contracted by contact, *moral* weakness, wickedness, or degeneracy, even when inherited, is developed by association and teaching. Heredity acts in the sense of providing from infancy companionship and environment, and when to such influences is added the inability to find an honest and virile path towards self-aggrandisement, or even the bare sustenance of the physical part of self, the dangers of unfortunate heredity become manifest, while fortunate heredity leads to segregation from the unfortunate, to the strengthening of class distinctions, to the generation of hatred and jealousy, and to the perpetuation of evil. Individual development towards goodness and ideal happiness is hindered not so much by the accident of unfortunate birth as by the active and conscious opposition of inimical association, or the passive and unconscious obstruction of ignorant and adverse surroundings. The disposition of the mind to fun also often leads to the sowing of the seeds of evil.

Certain misconceptions widely prevail on the question of heredity. When it is intended to praise an individual or a race, the praiseworthy qualities are attributed to birth; and it is a weakness of human nature to feel flattered when one's vanity is tickled by an addition of complimentary ancestry to personal qualifications. When one does not possess the moral qualifications or has not had the opportunity requisite for distinction, it is some consolation to be able to claim a bit of the structure raised by ancestors, remote or recent, in any way distinguished, or to whom eminence is attributed for the satisfaction of personal vanity. When one has become great or useful, if one is unselfish the greatness is attributed to ancestry or environments, and if one is selfish it is claimed for one's own self. It is merely habit or tradition that leads the mind to find comfort in heredity. It is an attempt either to explain conduct as self-love prompts or else to shift personal responsibility. In the claim of heredity there may therefore be unselfishness as well as selfishness, but the attribution of evil

or of goodness depends upon the degree of animosity or appreciation, of dislike or of liking, that the object arouses. In such interested or unthinking conduct consistency cannot be expected. So when one that is liked is physically tall or handsome, bigness or beauty is associated with the liking, but when one that is disliked has the same physical features they enhance the dislike, and consistency is sought by the attribution of moral defects to the physical frame. In this, as in other matters of daily life, the defect of training and the domination of self in one form or another are displayed. What the self does, whether it praises or blames, must be right, and its attitude is unexceptionable. As an Aryan proverb says, "When one dislikes another the walk of the latter appears crooked, but an object of liking, even with a hump, becomes handsome."

Persons of a certain type of mind, having gained a position of prominence or the ear of the public, pretend to set a great value on heredity, especially if they and their protégés have no other claim to distinction or exceptional consideration than birth in the family, race, or group that happens to wield for the time considerable influence in human affairs. Their sincerity is tested by the fact that, while they worship heredity through the aristocracy of birth and wealth, they deny to their humbler compatriots the opportunities by which the founders of the families or of racial greatness so honoured by them succeeded, in spite of their humble origin, in attaining their rank. If there is virtue in success and any justification for its worship, every individual has the right to claim the opportunities by which success may be attained. The enemies of human progress and the advocates of privilege and monopoly do all in their power to deny those opportunities even to their fellow-countrymen, for whom, when self-interest prompts, they profess abundant love, but against whose advancement they always make a stand, and thus help to embitter the struggle of life.

Individually, the claim to superior brains, intellectual attainments, or moral worth on the ground of birth is difficult to establish. Unable to discover the causes by which a particular individual has gained superiority, people find it easy to attribute it to the virtues of parentage or teaching. If it were possible to trace for generations the history, traditions, and associations of every family and of every member of every family, as people note the history of the rise and fall of every nation from the actions, thoughts, and success or failure of its great or prominent men, it would be easy to discover the influences that have co-operated to make an individual great or small, virtuous or vicious. The probabilities are that in the human race, as in every department of life, diligent attempts at improvement, prudent intermixture, and careful nursing have the usual effect of producing a superior type, while adverse conditions produce the contrary result. In individuals, as in nations, the process of growth and development is slow and long according to human calculations. The process is often interrupted, or interfered with, or stopped altogether by opposing forces that prove stronger than the favourable conditions. Success or failure, a life of usefulness or of wickedness, thus depends upon the fortune of war between rival forces; and, as in martial combat victory lies with the more resolute and better-organised force, even if that force may not possess any moral claim to success, so in the battle of life between good and evil influences superior strength determines an individual's career and usefulness. Why and how the germ of that strength is generated in some individuals and absent in others it is beyond human power to explain, but it is within human power to nurse or to undermine it.

The influence of heredity in a person's career or development is inconsequential. Like a natural disposition to contract, or strength to resist, physical maladies, it is possible for one to inherit particular moral tendencies, but the seeds of good and evil require favourable conditions for growth and

development. The hindrances that retard or mar development in a large number of persons are well known. Parents that have somehow attained a prominent position or social importance, and thus possess the means and opportunity to rear their children in the right direction and make them useful members of society, are usually too much occupied with social conventionalities to devote the necessary time and attention to this duty. The children are therefore left to the chance of much the same influences as shape the character of children not favoured by clever or distinguished parentage.

While therefore in the struggling section of a community there may be found parents that recognise it as their duty to attend to the training of their children, and possess the necessary physical strength and mental energy to accomplish it, such a sense of duty is rare among the well-to-do classes, or what is called "high" society. Hence the children of hard-working parents are generally reared much better and render greater services to their community than the children of the wealthy, except in the too rare cases where mothers personally attend to the rearing of their children or can secure proper governesses. And so, when the neglected children of the well-to-do, with their brains and virile faculties undeveloped, grow up to manhood and womanhood, they tend to seek a cure for ennui in frivolities and pleasures. The meaning of the adage "Charity begins at home" seems to be rarely comprehended. The charity must commence in the nursery; for, until one perceives it to be the chief of one's duties to impart the best of one's moral possessions and experiences to those to whom one is anxious to bequeath material goods and chattels, the spirit of charity, or even the instinct of self-love, remains unfulfilled.

Similarly, while descent from criminal, inebriate, or wicked parents may possibly be a cause or a criminal, inebriate, or wicked tendency, evil results will probably be mitigated or averted if the children be removed early in life from evil contagion and example. Should criminality, inebriety, or wicked-

ness be found on strict and impartial inquiry to be inherited, it would be the duty of society, alike for its security and progress, to prevent issue of criminal, drunken, or wicked parents, or to segregate such issue as sufferers from infectious disease are segregated, or else, if either of these methods cannot for any reason be followed, to destroy such issue when born, just as it is deemed necessary to drown pups when their mothers have shown signs of rabies.

Opinion as to how far heredity or parentage, apart from association, has a dominating influence in forming or moulding human character naturally divides thoughtful and observant minds. Scientific investigation has not yet attained conclusive results, and each mind meantime bases its conclusion mainly upon its own disposition, interest, or experience. The mature decision of science must be respected, but the question is one of the mysteries or problems of life that may be beyond human solution.

Every person must have had among his or her ancestors, immediate or remote, some that were good, others that were not good, and yet others that were indifferent. Opportunities for distinction may have been afforded to some who utilised them, and to others who did not or could not utilise them. Under such circumstances it seems scarcely fair to claim distinction through such ancestors only as achieved prominence, and to ignore those that remained in obscurity. It is the same spirit of vanity that prompts people to claim credit for actions that turn out successful, and to throw the blame on others when anything goes wrong. To laud or to condemn without consideration of surrounding circumstances is a weakness that the superficial mind finds a difficulty in shaking off.

Pessimists, prophets of evil, and believers in the innate wickedness of human nature will take the view of condemnation, while optimists, humanitarians, and idealists will treat the matter generously and deem human energies to be best used, not in deducing unfavourable conclusions from the past but in

reclaiming and purifying the unholy, and in preventing innocent minds from falling under evil influence or tradition. The needy require attention and help, not those that are favourably placed. Whatever the ultimate conclusion of science, there can be no difference of opinion as to the potency of association, companionship, and training in forming character and in guiding the future career of every individual. Those that neglect to secure desirable association and training, or despise them when available, are enemies of their neighbours as well as of themselves. In every human brain the germs of vice and wickedness, as well as of virtue and goodness, the passions and appetites as well as noble aspirations, may be expected to exist. The relative proportion may differ, and if the difference is due to parentage individual responsibility becomes limited. It seems more practically helpful, therefore, to attribute the development of virtuous or vicious propensities to environment and example rather than to parentage. The responsibility for the existence of children must be brought home to the parents. The individual child, though not responsible for its birth, becomes after a certain age responsible for the consequences of environment.

A large part of the evils and miseries of mankind proceeds from the natural impulse of endowing self with all that is considered worth having. Anger, avarice, greed, lust, and vanity are not used against self or those that are associated with self. They come into play with increasing force in proportion as the object recedes from relationship with self. A burglar does not think of robbing his relation or friend. A lustful man does not cast evil eyes upon his own female relations.

Another part of the evils springs from ignorance of the proper use of one's faculties and possessions. As leisure is valuable for those that use it wisely, but leads those that have evil disposition or training to mischief; as solitude enables the thoughtful to indulge in meditation, but tempts the wicked to carry out their nefarious designs; as arms and weapons are

useful in the hands of the cool and self-controlled for defence of the weak and helpless, but are used by the thoughtless and undisciplined to injure others ; as beauty, regarded by an ascetic as skin-deep and by self-controlled worldliness as a thing of joy made for admiration and worship, affects undisciplined and untrained minds with other feelings ; so every attribute and endowment of man, physical and intellectual, may be either usefully or wickedly viewed and employed according to the training of the mind. Even knowledge itself, which should enable one to perceive one's insignificance in the vast cosmos and to feel humiliation in finding life too short and opportunities wanting to know more, makes some conceited with what they possess and leads them to treat with contempt others that have not come up to their standard. Every evil is, therefore, a product, in the first place, of the differentiation of self, and, in the next place, of the ignorance of the right use of one's faculties and possessions, such ignorance often injuring one's own self as much as the injury a wicked mind proposes to inflict on one.

Another product of the differentiation of self is discontent. It is at times an incentive to progress when an acute feeling is produced about one's ignorance, moral or physical weakness, and incapacity to comprehend or fathom the great forces and gifts of nature. But discontent from want of satisfaction of material joys nurses selfishness, results in attempts to secure pleasures, and injures oneself by inflaming the appetites and passions. A chronic state of discontent, like a continuous desire for amusement, unhinges nature and undermines moral and physical strength.

In a community closely bound by natural ties of interest, difference is fostered between classes and between individuals sometimes by selfishness, at other times by suspicion, and generally by denial of justice and of fair treatment. In a family related by ties of blood in addition to other ties, estrangement is caused by the disposition to take everything and to give

nothing—a disposition generally produced and fostered by the incorporation of strangers as wives of brothers and as husbands of sisters.

In international relationship, animosity is generated and encouraged by hypocrisy and intrigue on the part of the reactionary emissaries of Satan, whose joy lies in the perpetuation of jealousies, wars, bloodshed, and suffering, and in the prevention of an approach to understanding and friendliness between nations and governments. Satan will continue to be triumphant over the forces of good, and the miseries of mankind will remain undiminished, until the virile and virtuous units in every community largely outnumber the vicious and wicked, and until the most sagacious, sane, and self-restrained nations on earth control and guide human destiny. The thought of enjoyments and luxuries associated with material possessions and obtainable only by the obliteration of the sense of right and wrong has to be wholly discarded from individual, national, and racial aims before mankind can make a steady advance towards happiness without fear or risk of reaction.

The happiness of life consists in possessing physical and moral health and pleasant surroundings. Even when one has learnt the means of gaining health for oneself, how pleasant surroundings can be secured is becoming more and more the difficult problem of life. Pleasant surroundings include associates and neighbours in physical and moral health, whose example, if not teaching, exerts a healthy influence. When, however, the people one meets are brusque and unmannerly, and perhaps also seek to gain undue financial and other advantages from the contact, life ceases to be worth living, except in solitude ; for civic life depends upon unselfish respect for the common interests and equality of personal treatment. Persons placed above financial want try to secure happiness by contact only with persons in a similar or superior position. But this is not always available, as every one has to deal more or less with others not above want. When keen

competition in the struggle of life makes people lose their sense of duty to neighbours, life, instead of advancing, appears to be relapsing towards savagery.

In the complex conditions of human existence, mischief is often caused by accidents and misunderstandings that open a breach between individuals, classes, and nations; but such mishaps would not cause irreparable wrong if mischief-makers did not find in them a favourable opportunity for fomenting hostility. As an example may be mentioned the Spanish-American War of 1898. The occasion of this war was an explosion on board a ship, the cause of which was not definitely ascertained at the official inquiry, but was proved several years later to be a mere accident; yet in the meantime the advocates of bloodshed and rapine boldly attributed the explosion to design, and thus succeeded in inciting the United States to war. In private life, as in national and international affairs, there are lags, who deliberately sow and instigate discord either for personal ends or for the satanic satisfaction felt in the misfortunes of others. Accident or misunderstanding may sooner or later be discovered in its true light; but such discovery does not appear to make mankind wiser, more tolerant, or more charitable even after the accident or misunderstanding has exhausted its power of mischief, having made individuals that would otherwise have been good friends miserable for life, and turned nations that would otherwise have been allies into mortal enemies for generations.

The London Zoological Gardens have recently received from the Gold Coast a species of reptile called "burrowing snake," which finds its food by working through the ground to catch insects, whereby it has lost its eyesight through adaptation to its mode of existence, and has thus undergone a gradual process of degradation in pursuit of its prey. The human mind, however high-principled and well-bred, is in like manner degraded by sordid impulses and desires, through eagerness to secure prey for the satisfaction of momentary

joys. Unsatisfied desire makes it blind to the divine light ; satisfaction drags it down to the moral level of the snake. For individuals and for nations, as for players and learners in any department of life, it is beneficial to mix with others that are better than themselves, and it is equally injurious to have contact with inferior brethren. Thus it is that great personages and nations after achieving a certain standard of excellence stagnate and decay, while humbler people, by assimilating their teaching and example, advance towards excellence until stopped by similar causes.

It may be argued that greatness and position, like acquired wealth, should be freely bequeathed by the possessor to his issue, or to whomsoever he chooses to leave them, on the ground that, if such freedom were denied, people would not have an adequate incentive to exercise their faculties and to develop their virility. But as an inheritor of wealth has the freedom to misuse or squander his inheritance and to reduce himself to poverty, so the inheritor of honours should by misuse of position forfeit them. And, as thriftless sons deprive themselves of their father's gold, so classes and races that misuse the opportunities gained by descent from acquirers of fortune or position should suffer deprivation. After the experience of ages, if people have not the sense or the inclination to take steps to assure to their successors an honourable continuation of fortune or position, they must bear the blame for the demoralisation that adventitious circumstances bring on their progeny through their failure to secure for them virtuous teaching and companionship. The uselessness or mischief caused by unworthy inheritors of rank and wealth might be minimised if the acquirers had the choice of heirs beyond a restricted sphere, but custom and the domination of the material self stand in the way.

Virtue, not having personal interests to serve, is generally exclusive and retiring. Meeting with adverse conditions at every step, disappointed in efforts to propagate its principles of

thought and action, averse to having its motives misunderstood or misinterpreted by dominant worldliness, and prone to avoid contact with the misguided minds that have an itching to deride, virtue often deems the post of honour and of peace to be in standing aside and letting vice discover the error of its ways. That wished-for discovery seldom takes place, and vice, like a rank weed that no antidote can destroy, or like "high-born" insolence that finds a congenial soil in the sycophancy of self-seeking courtiers, thrives to the dejection and dismay of all that are anxious for its extermination.

Individual development is retarded and hindered by such association and training as nurse the lower and selfish instincts. All instincts and teaching that are selfish are generally vicious, for they generate an antagonism between self and the rest of mankind, whose loss, defeat, or annihilation can alone advance the interests or satisfy the cravings of self. In like manner national development is obstructed by counsellors who, having secured a hearing in the press or on the platform, manage by plausible advocacy of what they call patriotism to lead a community away from the path of duty. Patriotism from a national standpoint is a great ideal, because self and personal interests are forgotten and gladly sacrificed for the good of the community. But if patriotism is a virtue in the individuals of one community, it must also be a virtue in the individuals of other communities; and, if it becomes pugnacious and self-seeking, it can prosper only by the loss, extinction, degradation, or massacre of rival nationalities. In such a case, as in a fraternity of burglars or conspirators, mutual distrust and suspicion, with their inevitable consequences, disloyalty and treachery, take the place of co-operation for common interests and general advancement. Co-operation in wrong-doing is bound to be demoralising, as in nursing the plundering propensities against others it idolises self, which will at times feel itself injured or neglected and rise against the partners that have not satisfied its demands.

Suspicion is the progeny of Ignorance, which plays a conspicuous part in inter-individual, inter-communal, and international affairs. Christian Scriptures and Occidental Sages have described the entry of death into the world and other "woes" to the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, but the fruit which produces the seed of decay and destruction and is the cause of all human miseries comes of the tree of Ignorance and its branches, misunderstanding and distrust. Pessimism, which is a common trait of mankind, and the weakness of human nature to draw general conclusions from isolated instances, are responsible for the abnormal growth of the evil product. A few benighted and wicked individuals in whom the worship of self is most developed, who from birth have lacked the training necessary for a consideration of the feelings of others, and who scruple at no thought, word, or act, however savage it may be, so long as it may promote self-aggrandisement, continue, in spite of the advance of civilisation and culture, to keep the tree alive and to nurse the foul seed. This selfish class of people are also responsible for the existence of brusqueness and suspicion, which, in addition to legal preventives and remedies, are considered necessary to restrain the wily self-seekers. The existence of suspicion is evidence of the prevalence of the wicked section that is bent upon creating havoc in organised society and upon inflicting injury on innocence and purity. It produces consequences inimical to the advance of happiness.

If familiarity is, as it has been described, a breeder of contempt, it is also, on the other hand, a promoter of unity. No matter how revolting any moral or material evil may be, no matter what unpleasant results may have flowed, or may be expected to flow, from such evil, no matter with what force of caution preceptors and guardians may warn against it, the moment it is brought into cognisance acquaintance begins; immediately the human faculty of analysis and examination comes into play; and, should such examination develop into

familiarity, instead of being treated with contempt, it either becomes endurable and gradually acceptable, or has a considerable though often imperceptible influence on thought and action. Familiarity in certain relationships of life and in certain stages of the mind should be deprecated, not as breeding contempt, but as contributing to the loss of the mutual respect that is essential to human intercourse. It can breed contempt only when one wishing to avoid familiarity has any mental, moral, or material attributes that one deems it necessary for some self-interested end to conceal. The necessity for concealment of failings and weaknesses, physical or moral, arises from the predominance of worldliness, which seeks to present things as different from what they really are. So long as there exists any weakness or failing that must be concealed in order to secure personal worldly advancement, there must necessarily be what is called in others deceitfulness or hypocrisy, but in one's own self astuteness or diplomacy.

Distrust is a form of precaution to guard oneself and others under one's care from possible dangers and deceitfulness. The danger against which such precaution is most needed is the common desire to rob others of their possessions for selfish and personal gain. In the contemplation of such robbery the selfish mind does not hesitate to inflict injury and to attain its end by unscrupulous methods, so long as such methods can be adopted without personal risk. In the process of such contemplation, and after successful robbery, distrust naturally takes the form of trying to make the robbed (that is, the enemy one dreads) incapable of ever doing harm. For this end no means is deemed too foul or repulsive, and judicial authorities in every country have often to complain that, notwithstanding the advance of education and civilisation, false accusation and perjury are on the increase. Such increase, along with other regrettable conduct and demeanour, is attributable to the conditions resulting from the struggle for existence, which is becoming keener every day simply because the desire for

pleasure is increasing and because circumstances in which one finds oneself are tending to develop selfish instincts. In the more artificial and advanced stages of society, suspicion mars the usefulness of social intercourse, because every stranger is treated as if bent upon robbery, plunder, or selfish gain, simply because occasionally a stranger abuses the confidence reposed in him. Distrust and aggression are products of the mind when under the domination of self. They take for granted either that the pivot of existence is self, for whose benefit every other person and all things are created, or that wickedness is so ingrained in human nature that unless self can dominate others some other person or persons will bring that self under subjection—that unless one becomes a hammer one is sure to be made an anvil. Caution generated by such distrust or aggressive tendency may be necessary when a large number in a community or race are untrustworthy, or when an atmosphere of wickedness prevails; but, while it guards the interests of self, it injures the far more extensive interests of the greater self of which oneself is only a part by nursing and developing the feeling of distrust, and by directing human energies towards the assertion and security of the smaller self whose interests are taken to clash with those of others.

As laws and coercion are necessary to deal with the evil-disposed and criminally inclined persons that exist in every community, so self-assertion appears to be needed to cope with pugnacious pushfulness. One cannot take a step in daily life without coming in contact with such pushfulness. At all times and places it claims a monopoly of attention, of space, and of material comforts, ignores the equal claims of others, and does not hesitate to put others to discomfort for its own pleasure, or from want of feeling or through sheer caprice. Such pushfulness can be met or thwarted only by counter self-assertion. But, as harsh laws and coercion, even when necessary, undermine a State by the harassment of the innocent and by the development of self-complacency and vanity in the

administrators, so self-assertion, even when necessary, nurses conceit, turns the mind towards idolisation of self, and thus injures the abiding interests of self and of mankind. Self-assertion, like fire and other great forces in nature, is a good servant but a bad master. The difficulty often lies in drawing the line. Abstention when assertion is needed to cope with pushfulness, and assertion when abstention is the desirable course, are equally to be deprecated. Each self must be the best judge of what is necessary, and right judgment is rendered difficult by the influence unconsciously exercised by pushful and selfish neighbours. Some persons may have the good fortune to meet for the most part unselfish and well-bred people, but, as those are not the majority of mankind, and as the pushful and selfish appear in a worldly sense to prosper, the ways of the latter naturally become attractive through familiarity. Self-assertion is sometimes carried so far as to lead to contemptuous treatment of fellow-men by the avoidance of personal contact with individuals, classes, or races that are taken to be not of equal status. It should be pointed out to such self-asserters that, even if all other contact may be avoided, the dust from the roads on which the social or racial "pariahs" tread cannot be prevented from being blown by the wind to the sacred person and into the food of the privileged.

In backward countries and in less orderly ages there was the highway robber and the midnight burglar. At the present time in centres of enlightenment and power such gentry appear to thrive as much as ever, and to have in addition developed courage enough to indulge in hooliganism and robbery in broad daylight. One cannot walk in secluded streets or indulge in solitary meditation in parks and fields without being accosted by "unfortunates" of both sexes, and without running the risk of having one's skull split open. A further adjunct to civilised life is the police spy, who finds something to do in shadowing every unknown stranger as an anarchist or

a burglar, and who himself, if unscrupulous, may at a suitable opportunity feel tempted to become a robber or an assassin.

With the development of the robbing propensity, generated and nursed by the importance attached to material possessions, it is becoming more and more necessary to utilise detective ingenuity to hunt individual crime, and to ascertain the position of armaments of rival States. The system of espionage thus necessitated, in addition to the inquisitiveness caused by a desire for excitement, appears to be invading the peace and privacy of family life, until one does not know whether the servants employed to do one's work are not in the pay of outsiders to convey to them the secrets and the ways of the employer's household. The more prominent persons are subject to the attention of the spies of the scandalmongers and of burglars, and the less prominent ones to those of police spies and curious neighbours. Thus people in humble life are shadowed by instruments of law and order, and, in addition to other annoyances, run the risk of having their good name taken away by false charges or personation. In high life private affairs, worldly possessions, and fair fame are liable to be endangered by the necessity of employing strangers. In all classes the difficulties that people have to face in leading healthy, honest, and peaceful lives appear to be increasing instead of diminishing with time and progress. As a woman's beauty tempts the rake, respectable appearance and decent clothes tempt the hooligan, while shabbiness in dress attracts the notice and suspicion of the guardians of order. The raising of the standard of material luxury is rendering life more complex and more liable to unpleasant experience and sensation.

Human relationships are generally of short duration. People meet once or twice or oftener in the course of life, and may never meet again—unless the ancient notion of rebirth, according to state of mind at the time of death, be correct. Instead of leaving pleasant memories behind, the more fleeting

the relationship between individuals and races, the more unpleasant and harsh is it generally attempted to be made. People are expected to meet only to get something out of each other, or to begin a lifelong quarrel. If this is the result or the advance of civilisation, it is difficult for observers to acknowledge the advanced state to be better or happier than the primitive ways of old.

A common weakness of human nature is to note disagreements, and not similarities, with fellow-beings, and to give more importance to differing attributes than to common endowments and possessions. What is usually understood by education does not appear to have much influence on thought or conduct in the matter. Public education is, at present, generally directed to enable people to read and write, so that they may earn a livelihood. In every country hundreds or thousands of children, more or less educated, are turned out of school without adequate training in morals and manners. The result of such defective teaching, combined with the easy conviction of individual importance, is an increase of bad manners, miscalled "independence." Some minds are so constituted that their first impulse is to suspect or to make fun of any strange person or thing that they had not seen before. This tendency is observable in infants as well as in adults: in the case of adults it is a proof of defective training, in the infant stage of the mind it may be changed by suitable association. The germs for both dispositions—to note differences and points of agreement—exist in every nature, and the germ that receives most encouragement from childhood thrives the best, while the other by disuse or suppression becomes weak and is gradually extinguished. Associates and teachers are, as in so many other matters, very largely responsible for the turn that the mind takes in life.

In the past ages the greatest stress was laid on differences of religion, and religious animosity and bigotry were mainsprings of human conduct. More blood has been shed, and more

persecution and tyranny has been practised, in the holy name of religion than in any other cause; and the bloodshed and brutality, while making converts of weak and easy-going minds, have sorely wounded the humane and tolerant spirit of true religion. In more recent times the anxiety of reputed religious persons to save their own souls led to the association of egotism with piety and proved the difficulty of controlling selfishness. The thoughts, the behaviour, and the preaching of noble minds, combined with greater knowledge born of facility of intercourse and weakening of the spirit of intolerance encouraged by dogma and priestcraft, have softened religious animosity; but, as the mass of mankind has not yet become civilised enough to be able to do without some form of enmity, and to be happy without vilifying and injuring fellow-beings, the ignoble impulses have been diverted to other channels.

Unhappily, the noble instincts of nationality and patriotism are often prostituted to fill the gap of hatred caused by the weakening of bigotry and by the spread of religious toleration; and difference in class, race, language, physical features, or dress is made the basis of the display of ill-breeding and of the fostering of the evil spirit. Man never appears to be happy without some form of animosity and hate, and without nursing the traditional incubus that has continuously hindered his progress. In this connection the persons responsible for the continuance of evil are generally those that seek to serve selfish ends by an appeal to the worst passions and prejudices of their compatriots. They find it easier to gain fame and fortune by pandering to national vanity, and by exciting racial, class, or individual hostility, than by encouraging the spirit of humanity and toleration, which in the present state of culture can appeal only to a few.

There are others in humbler positions, not equally responsible, who passively abet the commission of wrong by not attempting to counteract the teaching of the prominent advocates of Satan. In the suppression and uprooting, as in

the encouragement, of evil, persons of birth, prominence, worth, or wealth have doubtless greater responsibilities ; but every one, however humbly placed, has opportunities of helping the advance of his associates and others over whom he exercises direct or indirect influence. These opportunities are often neglected or omitted, and as a result the lives of many are bound in miseries. In ordinary worldly affairs neglect of opportunity shipwrecks a potentially useful life. In the prevention and destruction of evil such neglect is almost criminal lunacy.

Hitherto wealth has been generally regarded as the symbol of greatness and power. With the wider diffusion of competence and with the development of independence, the disposition to worship the possessor of wealth is diminishing ; but, as in politics people rush to revolution and anarchy to avoid tyranny, so the snobbery of worship of the wealthy is giving place to the worship of popular prominence. An ordinary person, however good or noble he may be, has no chance of securing recognition of his merit until he manages somehow to strike the imagination of the multitude. Attempts to gain distinction—to stand out prominently somehow—rouse suspicion among jealous associates and rivals, and suspicion easily leads to hostility. This phase of mind is more observable among semi-civilised individuals and races than among quite primitive or highly cultured classes. There is also a disposition in half-trained minds to maintain an attitude of friendliness or of opposition to a proposal they have once adopted, whatever reasons may emerge to justify them in changing it—a perversity that may arise either from self-love or from reluctance to admit an error.

There are also minds that act upon the impulse of the moment, without thinking of the consequences of their acts. This impulsiveness springs either from a defect in natural disposition and want of proper training, or from a conviction gained from observation that death cancels all bonds and that

enjoyment is the best thing to strive for in the short span of life. Apart from self, an affection is felt for children and other near relations, not necessarily for their own sake, but because they are chief contributors to personal satisfaction, because they are amusing in infancy, or because they are likely to be more helpful, materially and morally, as they grow up, than strangers. It is curious to note how one's interest in and attachment to another grows in proportion as that other is in a position to do one some service. The people that are vain of their name value children and others that will, perhaps, some day or other bring distinction to the name, or at any rate keep it alive to posterity.

Every person and every thing appears to be an instrument either of good or of evil or else of a mixture of good and evil. If one cannot be useful in life, one is bound not only to be useless, but also to be positively injurious. Man is endowed with faculties and has opportunities to use them. Though the neglect to use them may not cause direct harm, yet it is a source of evil as an act of omission and as a bad example. Dutiful persons in prominent positions abstain from and discourage acts that in no way threaten them with personal injury but are likely to form an excuse or an example to others that may not have the same training and self-control to avoid drifting to evil. Every one has a potential prominence among his associates through setting a good or a bad example ; and it is either ignorance or defective training that leads one to forget one's responsibility in life and to say or do things that perpetuate or increase human miseries.

Apart from the evil instincts of mischief-makers that gloat on the miseries of fellow-beings, all the hindrances that bar man's advance towards peace and happiness are based on the consciousness of self as a separate entity from the rest, on the natural tendency to consider the interests of that self to be the most important in life, and on attempts to run down other selves in order to secure its importance and enjoyments. If

the others could be speedily run down to extinction without any process of preparation, the evil consequences of the worship of self would be considerably minimised. But man lives on jealousy and vanity, so that, if others are extinguished and no rivalry exists, life is doomed to dullness. It becomes thus the desire of self not to extinguish but to conquer or to get richer and more powerful than others, to keep them alive and in a condition of subjection in order to minister to the joys of itself. In this way is brought about a state of affairs that necessitates attempts by every self, by fair means or foul, to subjugate others and hold them in a state of greater or less bondage as may suit the purpose of the dominant self. If attempts by other selves to throw off their shackles were not made, and the self that is dominant for the time were assured of the continuance of its unquestioned supremacy, it would itself become listless and inane, and the zest of life would be lost. Hence the dominant self delights in keeping other selves in just as much control as may lead to its comparative security, and by allowing some latitude to others for its temporary interest it restricts its own dominance. The worship of self thus cuts both ways. Abject slavery of others demoralises both self and the slaves; extinction causes inconvenience; freedom endangers dominance; and so self has for centuries been changing its attitude from one course to another, and has been unable as yet to discover which is the most desirable and least hurtful course to adopt in permanence.

In the struggle for the establishment of social order, masterful self, finding it necessary to assert itself, led the mind in its crude state to the condition implied by domination and subjection. As a temporary measure at a primitive stage or in times of disorder, it may be necessary to establish the condition; but, if continued longer than is absolutely necessary, it inevitably becomes a fruitful cause of unhappiness and evil both to the individual and to the nation. It is doubtless often necessitated by the existence or appearance of evil, and

until evil is entirely extinguished domination in some form is essential for keeping evil under control. What form that control should take depends greatly upon the circumstances of the time and the country ; but, having got used to a form of control, and being naturally timid and over-cautious, authorities with whom the initiation of change rests do not exercise their faculties to devise methods by which, while evil is controlled, good may be encouraged, and by neglect of such initiation they let matters drift in the old groove.

In individual life subjection of the appetites and passions to judgment and reason is necessary for happiness and usefulness, but their extinction may lead to indifference and inanity. The regulation of control has therefore to be so managed as not to interfere with the free play and natural development of manhood and of all the virile faculties of every individual and of every race. Any sort of interference with such development, whether undertaken in the name of law and order, or for the good of the persons interfered with, or on any other plausible pretext whatever, hinders progress and happiness. In every well-organised community wickedness and crime have to be kept under control and surveillance ; but, if the necessity for controlling crime is made the excuse for inhuman proceedings on the part of representatives of the law or for the domination of one class over the rest, or if such representatives are not clever enough to know their duty and feel more anxious for their personal power than for the suppression of evil, the healthy development of the nation or State through the individual is retarded or barred. As appetite when uncontrolled grows with eating until it causes dyspepsia, disease, and death, so power over fellow-men when uncontrolled is apt to grow until it intoxicates the holder into becoming a tyrant or forces the sufferer to rebellion, causing general unhappiness and ultimate disruption. On the other hand, freedom too, unless controlled by a cultured mind, has a tendency to seek more until it makes its possessor forget the

obligations attaching to it, and, when others claim a similar right, degenerates into anarchy, civil commotion, and disorder.

The traditional human weakness for power over fellow-men for the sake of social order, when the mass of mankind was in a state of barbarism and when the mind had not yet heard the voice of duty and wisdom, brought into existence authority under the name of Imperialism, which had to clothe itself in pomp and grandeur and to display overwhelming force in order to dazzle the ignorant mass into obedience. Imperialism, as still understood and defined by many persons, is a remnant of ancient barbarism, descending from times when social order rested on the power of one individual or of a few men to command fear, and when the ideas of justice and mercy had no influence on the conduct of the rough and untutored minds over which such individual or group established sway. Humane religions accentuating the brotherhood of man, and in more recent times political doctrines of equality and liberty, have overthrown the primitive basis of organised society ; and now the aim is to establish society on a sense of duty, of justice, and of right. That sense, however, although more developed than in the past and expanding with the advance of education, example, and desirable environments, is by no means yet sufficiently diffused in any organised community of men to exclude wickedness, force, and fear, from influencing its conduct. So long, therefore, as every trace of satanic influence is not extinguished, and crime springing from selfishness does not become so rare as to be easily detected and punished so as to prevent repetition, the continuance of patriarchal government in some form seems indispensable. Imperialism, however, is effective only in the hands of a single ruler placed above his subjects by commanding intelligence and powers of organisation, or by other considerations, such as birth or election, which still have force to hold society together. Such an imperial ruler may delegate his powers to others for facilitating the business of administration, but must

remain in fact as in name the sole repository of power, of justice, and of mercy. The State that has at its head a ruler of signal knowledge, experience, and wisdom, as has happened at times in human history, cannot but be a model for mankind. The success of a monarch, however able, depends very largely upon the instruments he may have at his control; and those instruments should reflect in State affairs the wisdom of the Sovereign, and so they do when they know their master to be eagle-eyed and vigilant. The barbarous idea, however, which survives to the present day, of endowing a small class—such as a few families, some of whose members have, sometime or other, served the State—or of associating imperial sway with a whole race composed of human beings of all categories in life, appears to be discrediting the best characteristics of Imperialism. If all members of a race, or nation, or class, or family are to be associated as an imperial brotherhood, it is essential that each should enjoy the chief necessity of life—to be above pecuniary want. For a member of an imperial race or family to seek service or work for gain, or to tramp all over the habitable globe to earn a livelihood, is conducive neither to imperial grandeur nor to worldly advantage. If, therefore, it is intended, as some reactionaries seeking popular favour profess to wish, to give imperial prestige to the whole democracy which in certain European countries has come to exercise more or less considerable power in political affairs, every member of the democracy should first be given a share in the profits or spoils that are gained by the nation as a whole or by any of its members owing to its imperial position in the world. The only other alternative is to send every needy and impecunious member of the imperial race to dependent countries with full powers, as desired by some reactionaries, to strip the “subject” race of every bit of coin and every rood of land it possesses, and to distribute the spoils equally among the members of the “imperial family.” Then there may arise the danger of the imperial race increasing in such numbers as to render even an

equal distribution ineffective to give a competence to each individual. Perceiving no way out of the difficulty, people in the ranks of wealth and fashion, together with their financial onhangers, find it useful to profess unbounded sympathy with the toiling masses and anxiety for their interests, while wishing to retain all power in their own hands and all perquisites for their relations and friends. The spirit that prompts Imperialism must necessarily be selfish, and when it changes its selfish character it should scorn duplicity and cease to wrap itself in democratic disguise—to profess anxiety for the advancement of the masses with the transparent purpose of setting up rivalry among different sections of the community.

Modern Imperialism, unable to stem the tide of democracy and of human rights, has taken a turn that is fraught with the gravest peril to mankind. Its favourite policy is to resist or to sweep away what it deems noxious to its own existence—equality of opportunity, fair play, popular rights. The people, however, are becoming too strong and resolute to permit Imperialism to carry out its policy by the high-handed methods of despotism. So it has devised an indirect means for the attainment of its end. It finds the masses becoming unheroic in seeking ease, justice, and peace, and so it tells them that the way of happiness is to set themselves up as idols without any sense of responsibility or consideration for other and inferior races. The masses, finding the struggle of life getting keener, may some day swallow the bait. Every one likes to play “the big game,” especially when there is associated with the play a chance of relief from financial stress; and when the game becomes impossible at home it is next best to be able to play it abroad. The weak point is that the masses cannot be transported to the country where the game may be played, nor can the races over whom Imperialism is to hold sway be brought overseas to the masses. Hence this game degenerates into a hypocritical appeal to sentimentality, which enables a few to play it for a time

abroad and on their return to prepare their humbler compatriots for similar conditions at home. What will be the ultimate end of it all it is not the interest of Imperialism to inquire. For the time it is pleasant to the players, and, in the words of a prominent imperialist, "Damn the consequences!"

In every country there are men and women with high ideals and with the potentiality of greatness that take occasion by the hand and become conspicuous, and thus may play an imperial or at least a prominent rôle. It is not given to everybody, however, to find the opportunity or to take advantage of it when presented; and often when it does present itself it is lost through the influences of evil training and association and by the aspirant's ambition to be taken as stronger and better than he actually happens to be.

Imperialism would present stronger claims if it brought more work and employment, if it generated good manners and a high sense of duty to neighbours and dependents, and if it secured for the poorer classes better housing, more food, and healthier moral and physical environments. It will scarcely advance human happiness, however, so long as it is intended to make a few rich people richer and to place more uncontrolled power in the hands of the holders of authority. Imperialism is likely to aggravate the evils attendant on unemployment by inducing the labourer that is able and willing to work to cry out for less work and more pay. In the torrid zone, where the strain on the nerves is greater, a disposition to shirk work naturally prevails. In colder latitudes, the more favourable natural conditions are counterbalanced by the duel between labour and capital, by the desire of each to gain the greatest advantage over the other, by fondness for liquor, and by the increasing desire for amusement and frivolity. Trade unions and combinations may be necessary to control the selfishness of capital; but unless they themselves avoid the quicksand of selfish greed, which mars the full usefulness

of capital, the remedy will be no better than the disease. As regards loafing and laziness, with which capital often taunts labour, these defects are not confined to the streets and the workshops; and it is to some extent because they are associated with leisure, wealth, and position, that in these days of Imperialism and equality some weak members of the toiling classes deem it fashionable to adopt them.

While the aim of education, culture, religion, and civilisation is to remove artificial distinctions and to elevate mankind towards the divine, Imperialism, like despotism, priestcraft, privilege, and monopoly, denies the brotherhood of man and perpetuates animosity and hatred. It also nourishes and develops hypocrisy and duplicity, in professing one principle of life and practising another. Its effect is always observable among those who, having personally and materially gained most by it, speak of their countrymen as of an imperial race, but at the same time resist every proposal to extend the franchise or other rights to the people whose favour is sought by flattering them as possessors of imperial instincts, and complain of their behaviour when they display independence or indicate a desire to participate in the gains that have accrued to the imperialists owing to birth in the imperial country. It will generally be found that those that pose as the most patriotic imperialists and profess anxiety about the unity of the State are the most ardent advocates of a separatist policy.

Imperialism, like other human institutions, may be either progressive or reactionary. Owing to the turn that reactionaries give it by clothing it in a garb of patriotism, which it is far from their intention to develop for the benefit of the masses, and owing to its traditional association with irresponsible power, progressives naturally condemn it as opposed to the interests of the multitude. For it is in fact used to exploit the masses for the benefit of the leisured class, by intoxicating their minds with an idea of their importance

be justified in lightly taunting other races with being backward or inferior. The progenitors even of the advanced classes in every great race or nation of the day were not so very long ago, as human events are reckoned, in an inferior or backward condition. It is hardly politic to claim superiority when by a turn of luck, or by a sudden and unaccountable withdrawal, weakening, or disappearance of the reasoning faculty and virility, any individual or race may revert to a position of inferiority and helplessness.

In modern life so much importance is attached to the possession of riches as the passport to confidence, ease, and usefulness, that the acquisition of wealth, instead of being regarded as the means to desirable ends, has itself become an end, and an end to be gained by any possible means. In every honourable occupation of life happiness lies in the effort to gain an end, and in endowing the effort with all the best qualities of the mind. The pursuit of wealth, on the other hand, is always degraded by an incalculable element of luck, and by the wretched desire to profit at the expense of others. In other appetites the desire ends with satisfaction, and enjoyment reaches its limit at least for a time ; but in the case of wealth the appetite increases by what it feeds on. The immoderate satisfaction of other appetites causes physical malady ; the unceasing pursuit of wealth, though it may not cause physical ailments, produces mental incapacity for more intellectual enjoyment. A competence gained by personal labour is most desirable, in order to free the labourer for other and happier pursuits ; but, as soon as such competence leads to selfish pleasures, its desirability and usefulness vanish. Strict honesty and ability seldom secure wealth without an element of luck, and after it is secured it begins to be scattered, if not by the lucky acquirer, certainly by those into whose hands, without any exercise of virility on their part, it eventually descends. Wealth, instead of placing its possessor above want, as it is meant to do, in order to leave him free for more useful

objects, increases the appetite for more riches, and creates other wants, which demoralise existence. The most curious thing in connection with wealth is that those that have it not are anxious to have it, while all the time abusing its fortunate possessors, and that, as soon as they get it, they begin to look down with contempt upon such as are still struggling to gain it. Something like the same feeling is observable also in the matter of political rights.

Money is necessary to secure the means of physical sustenance. When it is honestly and honourably gained, properly spent, and reasonably enjoyed, no harm to the moral self can accrue. But when money becomes the god of life, when the acquisition of it becomes a passion to which moral scruples and the sense of honour are gradually sacrificed, and when the balance of mind and judgment is lost on its attainment, then money becomes an instrument of Satan and a great enemy of man.

The two great appetites—lust for gold and sexual lust—if not kept under strict and constant control, become the tyrants of individual existence. Those that permit these appetites to get the mastery over them can never be trusted: for the sake of their satisfaction they may betray the highest and most sacred interests committed to their charge. Such betrayal is generally to be looked for in persons in whom the idolisation of self is most advanced; and, as it is difficult to find in worldly pushfulness the entire absence of self, every pushful person, even after conspicuous service, continues a “suspect” until death.

It is a curious study to note the ideas of various classes on the subject of happiness based on enjoyment of self. The wealthy and the poor, the capitalist and the labourer, the master or mistress and the servant, the teacher and the pupil, the ruler and the subject—these form groups in every community, and the ideas of each section are wholly opposed to those of its rival, and each section, like religious denominations,

believes its own view to be the only correct one. A member of one section coming by circumstances to belong to another naturally changes his view, but after the change he would scarcely admit the inconsistency of his first and last professions. Property expresses contempt and suspicion of poverty ; poverty attacks wealth as the source of all mischief. Power distrusts all that are not in power ; the latter condemn power as unjust and oppressive. Yet when those that condemn an order different from their own get into that order they change their opinions and condemn those whose ranks they have left. One type not sprung from the rich censures the rich for idleness and for wasting time in social conventionalities, dissipation, and sport. Another type not sprung from the poor taunts the poor with being miserable through laziness or with descent from progenitors as worthless as themselves. The issue of a prosperous person that achieved success by labour, good luck, or sacrifice ignore the labour, luck, and sacrifice of the ancestor, believe their family to have the divine sanction for greatness and prominence, and object to the claim of others to become prosperous by labour. A nation—which means the leading persons that mould a nation's life in politics, literature, and society—a nation whose forbears achieved freedom or fortune by successful struggle tries to prevent other nations not free or equally fortunate from gaining those desirable possessions. Thus are perpetuated animosity and jealousy, which, while furnishing incentives to individuals and nations that are not favoured by fortune, also lead to the demoralisation and decay of the progeny of clever and successful persons and races. While there are doubtless good, bad, and indifferent among the rich and powerful, as among the poor and the subject, yet condemnation of the rich and powerful for their good fortune and contempt of the poor and subject for their bad fortune are wedges that cleave asunder class and class, and race and race.

On the whole, and considering the temptations, it is rather

surprising that wealth and power have not more frequently abused their opportunities. When either does abuse them, it generally commits suicide, or is dragged down by those it offends. But, if wealth or power is to be blamed for occasional wrong-doing, what should be said of undutiful poverty and subjection? A great many of the poor owe their wretchedness to a want of the sense of duty, of modesty, of good manners, and of careful training. Labour is considered degrading; the labourer claims a right to dictate. Impertinence is taken to be independence, and the greater the concession the less it meets with satisfaction or gratitude. Instead of honestly seeking to improve their condition by meritorious service workmen raise a reiterated cry of too much work and too little pay. "More pay" does not seem to improve matters, as it too often goes to the public-house or the music-hall; and the leisure gained by less work is too often wasted in flirtation and gossip.

In order to secure attachment, devotion, and obedience, it is usual for leaders to flatter followers and supporters by praising their race and blood; but their insincerity is manifest from their disinclination even to mix in social intercourse with their humble supporters, except by way of very occasional condescension. There is indeed no superior or imperial race of the kind usually understood by those expressions. But a race may certainly be considered superior when it is devoted to its leaders, and its discipline is such as to hold under control the appetites and passions equally after success and after defeat in war or in other risky enterprises. And a race is certainly inferior when it neither has the ability to produce gifted and unselfish leaders nor the discipline to obey as well as to command. The general impression is that the born rich, having had the best opportunities for education and training, and being placed above temptation, are better fitted to serve the State in positions of trust and responsibility than those that have been brought up in needy surroundings. On the other hand, there are many

that believe hard conditions better fitted for the development of character than ease and wealth. No general rule can be laid down : good men and true arise out of all conditions of life, and there are good-for-nothing people in all classes, among the poor as well as among the rich. So long, however, as the rich are abused for doing anything but distributing their wealth among their needy and unemployable countrymen, and the poor are denied opportunities of distinction on account of their poverty, an antagonism of interests will prevail, and the encouragement of such antagonism by responsible persons will lead each class to try to hurt the other. As antagonism of class hinders progress in a community, so the demon of race hatred and prejudice, often called into existence for selfish ends, bars cordiality of international relationship. It often finds ready worshippers, especially when leaders encourage the worship for the sake of cheap popularity or in consequence of their defective training for capable rule. Having been worshipped till it becomes a traditional object of veneration, it naturally assumes the position of tyrant, uncontrollable except by a moral and material revolution.

Class or race hatred does not appear to grow less as democracy advances. In aristocratic or ardently monarchical communities it has usually been less than under modern democratic conditions. The evidence is the freer social intercourse under monarchical or aristocratic institutions, while under modern systems, with the disposition to pamper undutiful and uneducated people, and with misplaced and extravagant notions of their importance and power, class and race hatred is increasing. Strikes and riots with violence are more common in democratic than in aristocratic countries. It is a peculiar and mischievous development of democracy, which bodes no good to anybody, for organised labour to claim freedom to combine, to strike, to stop work at pleasure, to dissuade others from work, to put the whole community, including innocent persons, to inconvenience and suffering,

and even to resort to violence and lawlessness, while denying to the State as representing society the right to suppress such lawlessness by force. Capital is doubtless responsible for the provocation given to labour by its attempts to monopolise profits and by its denial of just consideration to labour for its share in the production of the profits, and means ought to be found to remedy the evil; but to permit labour to do wrong as well, and perhaps worse wrong in the shape of violence, will not remove the injustice and selfishness of capital or advance the cause of democracy. It ought to be distinctly laid down by authority, if in imperial democracies authority has any chance of vindication, that lawlessness, rioting, and violence will be suppressed without fear or favour, and that attempts to incite race hatred will also be equally punishable. Before democracy advances further and the younger generation gets more intoxicated by flattery and "rights," they ought to have better education and training; otherwise the consequences will be civil commotion and disorders at home, and international bitterness and strife abroad.

A potent hindrance to ideal happiness is the worship of matter, which leads people to put a higher value on material than on moral considerations, implanting in the mind in childhood, and exemplifying in manhood, the necessity for taking care of material things because these attract so close attention. All theoretical teaching is supposed to be directed to the appreciation of the substance and the neglect of the shadow, but practical teaching to differentiate shadow from substance is either wanting or conducted in accordance with traditional and uncritical notions. It is seldom recognised that matter is the shadow, which is by nature constantly shifting, and which no amount of care can make stationary or permanent. Moral life is the substance, since its safety and welfare once secured cannot run any risk of change or loss. In the worship of the shadow of matter, education, so essential to

culture and happiness, is directed to the advance of commercialism and to serve the purpose of material gain and glory. In a proper education, indeed, material considerations should not be neglected: they should form an adjunct of moral culture and greatness, which may be expected to serve the purpose of material needs as well. Education divorced from morality and humanity, however successful it may be in material life, cannot but lead to demoralisation and to the loss, ultimate or immediate, of material advantages.

From the successful worship of matter comes pride or vanity—"the never-failing vice of fools." From failure come discontent, jealousy, and enmity towards persons that have achieved success. Intoxication of sudden success is bad enough, but when material success generates pride, when failure rouses animosity, and disuse of the faculties causes listlessness and lethargy, demoralisation and decay appear difficult to avoid. Success generates pride, and pride produces self-complacency. With complacency all desire and attempt for further progress are stopped, with stoppage of progress stagnation sets in, and stagnation in nature precedes the end. Pride is a laudable trait of the mind when it prevents any ignoble or unworthy action, expression, or thought; but when it leads, as it often does, to such worship of self as to disregard the claims of others to consideration, it becomes an instrument of Satan for the propagation of evil.

In connection with pride, heroism has come to be identified with the infliction of injury and pain to fellow-creatures. To kill or rob others, when there is no superior or stronger authority to prevent or to punish the act, is considered heroism on the part of individuals and nations. It is a natural result of the worship of matter, and its development has taken various undesirable forms in life. The birth and growth of bad manners and of selfish notions—such as all rights and no duties, less work and more pay, and impatience of control—may be traced to that development. The disposition or want

of hesitation to inflict physical or mental pain on another for self-glorification or satisfaction is a manifest test of satanic influence leading to forgetfulness and disruption. It is likewise apparent in the dislike, hatred, and suspicion excited by difference in birth, blood, family, race, or sex. If it were possible to feel the disruptive sentiment mentally and yet to abstain from expressing or communicating it, not much harm would be done, except to the culprit himself.

It is, however, by persons of whom Satan has the greatest hold that animosity is encouraged and practised for unworthy ends, giving rise to various forms of torture and enabling them to gloat on human suffering. In ancient times, and even down to the present day in backward countries, the attempts to extinguish certain forms of crime against person and property by capital punishment were comparatively humane and justifiable. They were not more drastic than the measures rightly taken in watchful communities to exterminate or to check infectious disease. The substitution of imprisonment for capital punishment would be humane if its object were not merely to prevent evil-disposed persons from injuring others, but to give them opportunity for purifying their thoughts and habits. If humane and corrective treatment is not accorded in captivity, and if a steady endeavour is not made for the reformation of character, prison life not only hardens criminals but makes the State, the law, and the prison officials instruments for the infliction of torture. The idea of the modern civilised man is to spare life, when lives are much more numerous than of old, and often quite as useless; and for the satisfaction of punishing a criminal he is even prevented from committing suicide. To the untutored mind revenge is sweet only when practised on strangers, and it is not even contemplated against those that are part of self; but the notion of vengeance is savage, especially when persons, classes, and races in power, by their own acts or by their omissions to lead humbler mortals towards duty

and light, become instruments for the continuation or wrong.

Punishment should be not only deterrent but also reformatory; otherwise it degrades the punisher to the level of the criminal, and, like extortion of confession by questionable methods, is a relic of barbarism clinging persistently to the human mind. There are doubtless forms of crime, as also types of mind, which according to tradition and usage can be kept under control only by severity. The necessity of severity is an admission that there are passions of the mind which at times get the better of its reason, but it should also be acknowledged that passions dominate the mind only when it receives provocation. Ill-treatment or fear of punishment may keep it under apparent control, but the feeling of injury is bound to lurk within and to break out when it gets a suitable chance, or when by constant brooding over wrong it becomes uncontrollable even by fear. For the protection of society and of its innocent or peace-loving members it may be necessary to segregate wrong-doers and to try to reform their nature and habits. In some incurable cases it may be desirable to keep the criminals in lifelong quarantine and to permit no contact with human beings, but it is barbarism and brutality to resort to any methods that may savour of physical suffering, or to neglect any possible means of purifying the mind and morals of the criminals. When crime or evil, which injures society and retards its advance towards idealism and purity, cannot be otherwise stopped, the most humane method of extirpating it is, under present circumstances, to stop all intercourse of the offender with society, and, if in his seclusion he cannot be treated with kindness, to end his earthly career altogether.

When individuals do wrong to others the State interferes and punishes the wrong-doer, but when one nation or State commits an unprovoked attack on another there is as yet no power or authority to bring it to justice or to inflict on it

suitable punishment. If the aggressor comes off victorious, not only is its attack condoned, but it becomes a great and powerful State whose friendship or alliance every other State is anxious to cultivate. If the aggressor is beaten, the attacked State inflicts such punishment as it deems politic in its own interest, other States or nations having no voice in the matter, unless one of the combatants is so weak as to need help and the other Powers are strong enough and deem it desirable to prevent its extinction. This condition of international anarchy, as it may be called, places power in the hands of the master of big battalions. In order to prevent any single Power from being such master as would make it the tyrant of mankind, other Powers possessing large resources have to maintain or increase their combatants for self-preservation as well as for a voice in the political arrangements of the world. When a State becomes powerful enough to cripple or to swallow up another, and can by diplomacy manage to secure the neutrality of other Powers, it finds an excuse in some fancied wrong or misgovernment to attack the weaker State. When anything is to be gained by conquest or annexation, the weaker force is doomed to destruction, to increase for a time the glory and wealth of the victor, until it can be absorbed or until it intoxicates its conqueror with unquestioned supremacy or unchallenged insolence. It is a problem for impartial minds to solve, how far one State, morally or materially superior, is justified in interfering in the affairs of an inferior Power. If the object of interference is material gain and ill-treatment of the weaker people is needed to assure such gain, such interference, as every sane person would admit, advances evil by setting a bad example to individuals and nations, as well as by weakening the moral basis of existence. If a race or nation when strong can rightly interfere with another and a weaker people on a plausible excuse, there is no reason why a physically strong individual should not by that example and on that principle

attack, kill, or rob a weaker neighbour if it suits his temporary purpose to do so, and, if necessary, try to deceive himself and others by declaring his action to be dictated by a desire to benefit the neighbour.

Like interference, which may be rightly used for the benefit of weaker individuals and races, but is generally abused, independence has often led to undesirable consequences. It is sought for oneself or advocated for those that one regards as portions of that self, but it is resisted or condemned when others that are regarded as not connected with self wish to have it. One claims the right to say or do to others what one would never think of saying or doing to those in whom one feels an interest. The independence sought by every one to criticise or to go one's own way, when claimed by others, becomes unbearable. Individual development is most opposed by those individuals that happen to possess power to help or to thwart it; national growth is resisted by official routine and by the opposition of those in power from a desire for uncontrolled sway or from dread of change, which may reduce their powers and privileges. Thus freedom, power, and wealth, which are intended for the good of man, are often abused, and thus become instruments, not merely for ill-treatment of fellow-beings, but also for self-degradation and destruction.

In every matter of life Self is made the god for enthronement and worship—a much more injurious form of idolatry than the worship of inanimate clay or of stone images. Images may do no good except keep their worshippers in the path of virtue by fear of loss of imaginary favour, but they can do no such harm as the worship of self may cause. Present gain or temporary advantage of self is considered of greater importance than the consequences that may follow. Even the sacred name of religion is brought into disrepute, and religious sentiments and traditions are permitted to be weakened, for personal or momentary material profit. Religion loses its spirituality and

gains in outward observance in order to exercise material sway over ignorant or superstitious minds, and to prevent their free development. The decline of the influence of religion and of religious traditions is due to its materialisation, and is a revolt of the truly religious against show and ritual. People go to church, mosque, or temple to worship the Father of all. While apparently in prayer, their minds are engaged in worldly cares and thoughts. On coming out, they kill or rob or otherwise oppress for personal gain the children of that Father. Their words are divine but their thoughts remain worldly. Thus even religion becomes a mockery for all persons, and for priests and powerful individuals and classes especially it serves as an instrument for personal gain and often for the enslavement of fellow-men. With apparent fellow-feeling there is a disposition to have one's own way in every small detail as well as in important matters, and as two minds rarely agree as to the way in which a sacrifice is needed for agreeable relationship, the sacrifice is secured by compulsion and not by persuasion.

How man is apt to injure himself in the desire for momentary satisfaction is exemplified in the matter of cessation of work. After hard or sustained mental or physical labour rest is necessary ; but rest is meant to relax the continuous strain, to recoup nervous exhaustion, and to reinvigorate the faculties for resumption of work. When rest is sought for indulgence in irrational pleasures and in uncontrolled orgy, the respite does more harm than even continuous work would do. Holidays were originally devised for religious purposes ; they have degenerated for many people into misdirection of energy, which leads to frivolity, and from frivolity to laziness. Not only so, they cause disorganisation of individual and national life by simultaneous cessation of business and work for several successive days. Any interference with the regular exercise of all the functions is a source of evil. More work than what an individual frame can stand may lead to premature decay, but less work deadens the faculties and

leads to the degradation of the individual. As physically strong men with ill-regulated minds are prone to dissipate their strength in voluptuous revelry or in tyrannising over weaker brethren, nations when prosperous, strong, and successful, and not under the control of the best minds, misdirect their energies and activities to amusements, luxury, and pleasures, abuse their good fortune, and undermine their strength by attempts at domination over other peoples.

Interference with individuals and nations by a stronger force is morally justifiable when wrong is perpetrated, or even in case of omission to do what is necessary to advance human welfare ; but such interference is permissible only when the stronger force is itself free from blame in every respect and is above reproach. Otherwise the interference is an assertion not of moral superiority but of temporary material strength, and becomes oppression, degrading both the oppressor and the oppressed and setting a bad example to all mankind. No interference with personal or national freedom of action is justifiable unless entirely free from the taint of impure motives and selfish aggrandisement.

Expedients devised by the mind for the security of life and property and for the preservation of peace and order may be deemed interference with liberty. As, however, liberty does not mean license, and as security and peace are needed for human progress, interference is justifiable against selfishness and wrongdoing. Magistracy, police, and military forces are indispensable in order to guard society against aggressive and plundering propensities ; but some of the agents of law and order, especially in despotic and secretive systems of government, set themselves up as masters and not as servants of the public, forget their duties and responsibilities, and abuse their authority. It is the business of the police to prevent and to detect crime, and to get the criminal punished. When any member of the police or military forces commits crime or manufactures it for personal advancement, his brethren are

placed in a painful dilemma : either they must forget their duty and sacrifice the public interest by blindness to a comrade's wrongdoing, or else they must injure the *esprit de corps* by handing over the wrongdoer to justice. It is not uncommon to find even superior and well-educated officers showing a disposition to shield offending subordinates for the avoidance of notoriety or of discontent in the force. Thus it is found difficult to expunge evil from instruments for good, and salutary institutions harbour wrong because selfishness is too strongly entrenched in the mind to be ejected, and makes people blind even to claims of justice and truth. As the interests of burglars foster the belief that everybody is possessed of coin and jewels, so the interests of wicked agents of the law lead them to suspect everybody, and to try to make out every stranger to be criminally inclined ; and thus the abuse of interference continues to flourish.

The ideal of personal freedom proclaimed by political revolutions has in recent times taken the form of individualism. In some of its phases individualism is a process by which proper development of the faculties may be attained, but in social and political organisation individualism cannot be developed beyond a certain point without endangering the entire fabric of social cohesion. If individualism be freedom to think, discuss, and express opinions that one may feel to be a help towards human progress, it should be encouraged ; but if it assumes a form of selfishness based on a sense of infallibility, seeks not to persuade others to accept opinions but to impose them, or, failing to do so, separates itself from the general community, sets up a rival order or organisation, and assumes an unsympathetic or hostile attitude, such individualism becomes a disruptive force in human advancement. Freedom of individual development is essential, but it must not be antagonistic to the development of the mass of which the individual is a unit ; and, when it clashes with the interests of the general body, it must be subordinated to the equal freedom of the

whole, or at least of a majority. Personal freedom even in a highly artificial stage of social and political life is unattainable except by a long and laborious course of discipline and training in self-control, which itself proves that the freedom needs control from within, when it is disciplined enough to do without outside control. How freedom unaccompanied by discipline is abused and endangered is apparent at every step in the street, when individuals jostle and push against others as if it were their right to do so, but deny to others the same right, while, if others followed the example, there could only be frequent fights and consequent anarchy.

The modern ideal of nationalism involves training in individual self-control, but it takes away freedom ; simply because nationalism is still selfish and aggressive, being mainly directed against other and rival nationalities, while if no rival existed a nation would become divided into discordant elements and groups, which a common danger unites. It is so because individuals, families, and groups cannot control their selfishness. Every unit deems its own interests the most important, and, when sacrifices are required, wishes to be the last to be called upon to suffer. During training, subordination to every desirable form of social, moral, and political authority is necessary, but the training becomes defective if authority is not dutiful and unselfish. Authority can be so when it is not influenced by panic or prejudice, and when it is under control from within or without, while unregulated minds are apt to defy authority if it is not able to assert its power.

The antagonism of interests that pervades human existence, individual and national, is a product of selfishness and greed. The mind in its worldly career perceives its isolation, and learns to benefit itself at the expense of others because it finds others to be impediments to its advancement. Individual life hangs on a slender thread, which may be severed at any moment by illness, or accident, or enmity. Every day one sees around oneself deaths, dangers, and risks that individuals

run and suffer, yet one behaves as if one were immortal, and as if one's whole duty in life were to make one's individual existence as pleasant as possible and even to consider general existence dependent on one's own. The despot believes that the welfare and existence of the State over which he presides depend on himself, and, forgetting his mortality, identifies himself with the State. Individual selfishness leads one to think that the world is created for oneself. One is sometimes good enough to include in the *self* those few who contribute to one's joys and pleasures; but even these form parts of *self* for the sake of *self*, not for themselves, and cease to be so when they disappear or stand in the way of some selfish object, or otherwise appear not to contribute to one's joys. In individual, in family, and in national life, this state of things is observable. One loves wife or child, or father or mother, not for their sake, but for the sake of one's own self, because they care for or contribute to one's mental or physical wants. One values a friend in proportion as the friend is useful or helpful. One honours a national leader when the leader succeeds in making one's existence as a unit in the nation important, or when he convinces people that his power will do them good. Thus existence centres in self, and the uncultured self, which wishes to grab everything and give nothing, or as little as possible, without compulsion, is the greatest hindrance to human advancement.

Individual selfishness is fostered from infancy by bad example, by the inordinate desire to benefit oneself at the expense of others, by duplicity, which, while professing to have fair exchange, really aims at giving as little and grabbing as much as possible, and by the difficulty of finding high-principled preceptors and associates. Selfishness in national existence is nursed by the example of uncultured nationalities, which are always bent on frivolous pretexts to inflict wrong in order to gain some advantage. Selfishness in private life is encouraged by persons who for the sake of securing position or

popular favour excite vanity and animosity among compatriots. Such mischief-makers are either too dull to comprehend the risks they induce their countrymen to run, or so wicked as to feel their own interests to be well served if their aims are successful, and so desperate as to know that they cannot be worse off if their game miscarries. Thus under false pretences the embodiments of selfishness in every nation lead it, perhaps sometimes through temporary gain, to demoralisation and decay.

This selfish policy and personal greed led mankind to what is usually understood by "Imperialism"—a form of megalomania that intoxicated the brains of great geniuses like Julius Cæsar and Napoleon, as well as of a host of smaller men, who would always have been held as benefactors of their countries and of mankind if they could have resisted the promptings of selfish ambition. Imperialism, if it were based on high principles and ideals, if its aims were directed to advance human brotherhood at every suitable opportunity by the unification of political institutions, and if it could discard the savage notion of class, race, or individual domination, might tend to increase human happiness and welfare; but its votaries injure their own case by basing it on fear, on privilege, and on preferential treatment, and not on moral and intellectual superiority. Such a principle or policy can never be acceptable to the thoughtful portion of mankind, or lead to the conditions that it is the desire of the idealist to achieve.

The idealist himself, however, has his impatience, selfishness, and weakness. He has not sufficient consideration for the evil traditions that influence human conduct, and ignores the strength of the infection that evil-disposed persons spread around them, and of the selfish example that leads others to caution and distrust. He does not care to follow the worldly maxim of making himself pleasant in order to be popular. Like the enthusiast of a new creed, the idealist seeks to obliterate all evil and misery in a moment, makes insufficient allowance for

human frailties, and raises against himself the opposition of the timid and the thoughtless, whom he wishes to influence for good. The idealist does not perceive the distinction pervading various types of mind. One type is so conceited and consumed by selfishness as to be incapable of thinking of anything but its own personal gain, or of anybody but its own idolised self. This type finds passing happiness in self-aggrandisement, in personal pleasures, in inflicting wrong on others, and often in gloating on suffering, even if such suffering yields it no more than the momentary satisfaction felt by a brute at the agonies of its prey. Another is the begging type, which will not strive to achieve its ends by labour, but follows the methods of the gambler. There is yet another type, which is indifferent to causes and effects, lets matters drift, and would be disposed to proceed along unaccustomed paths if the lead were given by associates. The last type may be called passively virtuous—people that would not wilfully do anybody harm and at the same time would not go out of their way to suffer any personal inconvenience in order to do good. There is also the pushful type, whose defective training leads it to indulge in momentary joys or evil habits which do harm to itself and set undesirable example to others. The liquor-drinker and the tobacco-smoker, who have no consideration for neighbours not addicted to drinking or smoking and not accustomed to the strong smell of spirit at meals or to a puff of smoke into the nose and eyes, may be included in the type; and with them may also be included the motor driver who in a narrow country road drives past pedestrians at a pace that covers them with splashes of mud or smothers them with dust. This type of selfish lunatic thinks nothing of poking passers-by in the streets with his stick or umbrella, and in the anxiety to catch a train he recklessly pushes other passengers on a railway platform. Indeed, the spirit of inconsiderate barbarism or of blind conceit is displayed by this type in the most various ways in daily life—such as throwing banana-skins and orange-

peel in public passages, and indulging in pastimes fraught with wide degrees of danger. Then there is a type that is patriotic enough to wish its country good but selfish enough to prefer taxation to be borne, and sacrifices needed for the country's welfare to be made, by others. This type does not hesitate to smuggle into the country spirits and tobacco from abroad, simply for the pleasure of saving a trifle in duty. Moreover, there is a type whose temper is soured by unkind treatment, which can seldom think kindly of others because it takes all to be of the unkind type, and which in case of inability to have its revenge on its oppressor finds satisfaction in ill-treating those that may be placed in its power. The most common type appears to be that which does good to gain praise or reward, and inflicts injury when possible to benefit itself or to satisfy a grudge. Finally, there is the type of pessimistic idealist, who gives up in despair the improvement of mankind and finds joy in seclusion.

In the action of self in impeding human advancement two factors appear more potent than the rest. One is the attitude of pugnacious pushfulness—the desire to monopolise everything, to regard oneself as the hub of the world, and, in extreme cases, not to scruple wrongfully to deprive others of any advantages they may possess. The other, probably generated as an antidote to pushful pugnacity, is the suspicious caution that regards with dislike and distrust every stranger that does not show some endowments appealing to interest or liking. It is often difficult to say which is the most provocative side, and which is the cause and which the effect; but both undoubtedly contribute to produce the clash of interests and the mutual antagonism which, when the domination of culture does not exist, divide mankind—race, nation, class, and family—into hostile camps.

It is a common human weakness to be strong to the weak and weak to the strong, and for the passively virtuous to preserve personal peace by declining to interfere with evil.

The bar that the Satan of self places on the road to bliss is exemplified when those that gain power delude themselves with the idea that they are born to rule, when those that enjoy rights become unconscious of their duties, when those that gain wealth by birth or acquisition consider themselves to be superior beings, and even when those that have to work for their livelihood think more of the pay than of the due fulfilment of the labour that commands the wages. Until these characteristics based on self are surmounted, man's steady advance towards the goal of happiness cannot be secured, and the Satan of self will be the dominant force among mankind.

It is human nature to strive to secure ease, which is supposed to depend upon wealth. Those that possess or acquire wealth do not seem to think that its possession or acquisition confers ease or peace of mind. In no condition of life based on material wants is it possible for the mind to secure ease and peace except in the case of those fortunate mortals that find associates, companions, guardians, teachers, friends, servants, or employers as anxious to avoid hurting them as are good and dutiful parents towards children or devoted husband and wife to each other. Wealth or competence so necessary in life has the disadvantage of setting up distinctions, of separating its possessor from the needy, and of making wider the difference in social conditions; it makes poverty more glaring while intoxicating the wealthy with an idea of superiority; it generates an antagonism of interest by a want of mutual sympathy and tolerance: and it renders greater a risk always existing in case of antagonism of interests—the chance of civil war and revolution.

Ignorance and tradition and the consequent selfishness and timidity are so strong among mankind that it is often difficult to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate claims. Even good, cultured, and honest persons are made suspicious, and become indisposed to concede claims that are really

legitimate, because the persons advancing such claims are supposed to be of the type that is incapable of honesty and unselfishness. The vast majority of mankind would, it is believed, find happiness in doing good to others and in relieving suffering, but the happiness is often turned to misery and to self-accusation when the objects of pity prove to be undeserving of it, whether by nature, training, or selfishness. Among those persons to whom generous minds are anxious to render service there exists not unfrequently a feeling that it is the duty of the more fortunate to help the unfortunate without even an expression of gratitude, or to submit to be robbed without protest or complaint. This type of indolent selfishness, which will do nothing honestly to help itself, retards the extension of beneficence and charity.

It is a question that different minds may answer in different ways whether human ills are continued and progress is barred by blind and active selfishness as much as by its criminal or indolent fellow-type. Wealth often entails injury on its possessor and on the community by excessive expenditure on unnecessary commodities and by a wasteful disposal of energy that might have been utilised for the mitigation of human wants. Luxury and high living causes by repletion sluggishness in the action of the heart and the liver, entailing apathy and dullness in the brain. The injury may in the first instance be confined to the high and luxurious liver himself, and may be condemned as passive selfishness; but in human affairs every unit counts, and, when any unit by act or omission withdraws itself from active good, it does positive harm by setting a bad example of superficial enjoyment and by depriving others of a certain quantity of what might be useful to them. The responsibility of every individual in the social polity is great, and the higher and more prominent is one's position by birth, wealth, or worth, the greater is the need for the recognition of such responsibility. Want of gratitude may be pleaded as an excuse for omission of right conduct; but, when such

abstention does more harm to the abstainer than to others and entails a possibility of suffering on fellow-beings, it is a form of selfishness that may justly be condemned.

There may be difference of opinion as to the degree in which omission to do good is responsible for the prevalence of evil, but no doubt can be entertained that it is to some extent responsible, reinforcing so far the actual commission of mischief. If one notices preparation for murder or outrage and does not do what one can to prevent it by one's own unaided effort or by seeking such help as may be available, one may justly be held to have connived at the offence. Similarly a great deal of evil and unhappiness is the result of indifference on the part of people that remain quiescent from a conviction—an honest conviction—that it is useless to attempt to uproot human misery. Aryan sages in ancient times, finding worldly existence too wicked and incorrigible, retired from human society in order to avoid personal unhappiness or the risk of being infected by such wickedness. Many good and dutiful minds of the modern world, though not following the ancient custom of retirement from a wicked society, yet, feeling hopeless to reform it, either keep themselves at as great a distance as possible, or else for the sake of popularity and personal ease refrain from discouraging tendencies that they know to be injurious to the community. The ancient and modern methods are both based on selfishness. It is only by men and women who are prepared for self-sacrifice or to suffer martyrdom in some form in order to suppress evil, or who perceive the unity of life clearly enough to feel that it is not bounded by time or space, and that, as life does not end with the dissolution of one's material frame, seeking to benefit or purify mankind is the same as benefiting or purifying oneself or one's kindred, that the extinction of evil and the achievement of good can be secured. Others, with their narrow vision of life, with their sympathies contracted by the belief that death is the end of all, and

with their selfishness developed by example and training, convey from generation to generation the poison that prevents man from gaining freedom and bliss. A resolute and united stand by the good men and women of every clime can alone provide the antidote.

Society, following the tradition of barbaric ages, metes out punishment for physical injury or violence, but no punishment is as yet imposed for moral wrong-doing. If a person is physically poisoned, the poisoner receives punishment; but, if a person pours moral poison into the ears of innocent beings, the poisoner commits no legal wrong. If a person cruelly beats a son or kills him, the wrong-doer is rightly punished; but, if the same person taught the son to be a scoundrel or a thief, the parent is held to act within his parental rights and does not run the risk of punishment. It is time for authority and law to pay at least as much heed to moral as to physical obligations. Men and women that injure others by their words, example, or advice, whether in the Press or on the platform, whether out of doors or at home, should be held responsible for the mischief they do. At the present stage of human progress fear of punishment acts as a deterrent from wrong-doing, and should be extended from physical to moral wrong. Punishment, however, will never extinguish crime, though it may help to wake up in the untutored mind moral obligations. When selfishness or an appetite gets the better of reason, fear of punishment wanes or vanishes from the mind, which can never resist gusts of passion unless it is trained to a sense of duty.

It is difficult for good to prevail among mankind. For, in addition to the innate conservatism and timidity of human nature, which leads it to regard with suspicion every proposal that does not, according to its notions, tend to its benefit, there are few persons in any age or clime who are anxious to do good for the sake of alleviating human misery without any thought or incentive of personal gain, praise, or reward. Most

people appear to be either indifferent and easygoing or indisposed to take any trouble for others. When they have the opportunity of doing good or of preventing harm, they neglect or omit to take advantage of it either because there is no public praise for the service or because they look for gratitude, which may not always be forthcoming. This general tendency of the mind also leads people to accept with hesitation any proffered good because they conclude from their own disposition that nothing but selfish motives can prompt the act. Thus selfishness on the part of the server as well as of the served often mars the chances of good deeds.

It is matter for earnest consideration by inquiry, observation, and trial, whether coercion or kindness goes furthest in leading the average mind towards a sense of duty. In comparatively backward ages holders of power thought that ignorant people could be influenced only by display of force, cruelty, and even torture. At the present time authority is generally cultured and humane, but it cannot wholly get rid of the traditional idea of associating firmness with cruelty. Even when those in high places have civilised notions of securing obedience and order, they have to depend upon subordinates that are not educated enough to act up to the highest principles of life and that attempt to prevent crime, to reform criminals, and to secure lawfulness, not by humane methods, but by a mixture of force, oppression, and weakness. Hence, although "gaol-bird" has come to be a term of opprobrium and ridicule, yet, instead of being removed from contact with society by extermination or lifelong segregation, the criminal is let loose with his experience of prison life to practise upon his unguarded fellow-creatures refined forms of brutality and selfishness. Criminal tendencies are also nursed in another way. Under present conditions of life there has been considerable advance in culture, enlightenment, intelligence, and humanity. The zeal for education and knowledge has increased. Towns are full of institutions to relieve physical

suffering and to impart mental training. Steam, electricity, and wireless are performing miracles in traction, travel, and transmission of news. Ignorance and illiteracy are steadily diminishing. Yet, in spite of all this hopeful advance towards the goal of happiness, the popularity of a certain type of literature shows a morbid craving for the emotional, a prurient prying into mean and squalid details of crime and wickedness, a want of charity for the sufferings of neighbours, and a perverse predisposition to illegitimate amusements, which seem to have appeared to prove that human progress has to pass through quicksands and shoals that may wreck the mind unless considerable caution combined with resolution and clear vision guides its course. In the gradual disappearance of some forms of evil and in the emergence of other forms, the animal instinct of man to catch and keep hold of a thing that is running away appears to prevail.

Selfishness works in three ways: (1) self-preservation; (2) self-aggrandisement; (3) self-deception. In the first stage, the action of self is laudable since without its preservation and suitable development it cannot attain happiness for itself or help others to secure it. The second stage is commendable or reprehensible according to the motive that impels self in its career. If the desire for extension of influence is based on the avoidance of possible assaults on itself or on securing opportunities for service to others, it is commendable; but, if it is merely a satisfaction of personal ambition without the impulse of philanthropy, it is reprehensible as injurious to itself and as setting a bad example to others. In the third stage, it is blind to its own interests, and indulges in thought and act for attaining momentary enjoyments that demoralise and injure itself. This stage may be passive or active. In the passive stage, it abjures all desire for ultimate and permanent bliss, and the moment is all that its thoughts can compass, but it confines its evil effect to itself. In the active phase, it indulges in crime and wickedness. Crime and wickedness, when not

caused by a sudden impulse or provocation, are the result of the action of uncontrolled passions and of active selfishness on a normal mind. The mind may be of a degenerate type, which cannot be measured by the honest standard ; but, by the atrocities with which at times it horrifies society, it proves its ingenuity, which, if it had not been misdirected, might have been beneficial for itself. For brutal crimes severity in punishment or even torture, although fully deserved, appears to be no remedy, as past ages have shown. It injures mankind by further brutalising the guardians of law and order, and by nursing the morbid curiosity of the evil-disposed type. Crime, as well as the other fruits of the malignant tree of misdirected selfishness—such as brutality, drunkenness, pauperism, and incontinence—cannot be diminished by coercion or unkind treatment, but only by so improving the moral and material environments from birth as to render impossible the appearance of a degraded type of selfishness.

There are occasions when a display of selfishness may be justifiable—as in coping with its aggressive and inordinate type ; but, if it is more than a display and affects the mind or temperament of the defender, it becomes injurious. It is also objectionable when, as in worldly intercourse, self-assertion takes the form of brusqueness and rudeness in dealing with a weaker or humbler individual or nation, and of dissimulation, or profession of an intention different from the reality, when the party is of equal or superior strength.

A crude type of selfishness is exhibited by mankind even in misfortune. Every individual or nation is liable some time or other to meet with misfortune. It has a chastening effect on the wiser types of mind and leads them to reform their ways, to exercise greater prudence and virility, and ultimately to triumph over the misfortune or its effects. On other types its influence is often disastrous. One type, when misfortune comes, loses balance of mind and judgment, does not think of attributing responsibility to itself, and feels a grievance

against everybody else. Another type sympathises with the misfortune of others when these others are friends in whom it feels an interest, but even in such cases it experiences a sense of relief in not having the misfortune for itself. A third type rejoices in the misfortunes of others, and, instead of doing anything to render help, does all that is possible by word and act to make the sufferer more miserable. Freedom requires control when it is abused or misused to drag a fellow-man down to a lower condition.

It is a law of nature as well as of human welfare that anything that cramps growth and development is injurious. Every stage of growth has to be watched and regulated in order that the development may proceed along right lines. Difference among different types of mind arises from different conceptions of the right lines. It ought, however, to be apparent that in individual as in national life anything that favours the growth of selfishness—that is, of personal or class or racial gain at the expense or suffering of others—must be contrary to right principles. In an individual, if only those faculties are nurtured that help to bring momentary satisfaction, the higher and nobler faculties are enfeebled. Likewise any attempt to secure temporary material advantages for a class or a race must cause evil in various ways. Growth and development have doubtless to be regulated; but, if selfishness enters into the conception of regulation, or incapacity to guide it exists, there results an unwise repression of energy. Exuberance of energy, it is true, may lead individuals and races to occasional excesses from want of experience; but repression stifles energy altogether, and tends to dehumanise the mind. Wisdom and governing capacity are needed to direct development, individual and national, and, when such capacity is wanting, it may be acquired in time through mistakes and misfortunes; but it cannot come at all if timidity stands in the way of affording the opportunity.

The hindrances to progress and the evils of life are physical

and mental. Physical evils proceed from diseases caused by irregularities, from non-observance of the laws of nature, and from want of the faculty of observation. While the evils in individual life are caused by ignorance or rashness, the evils in national life are occasioned by the incapacity of public servants charged with the guardianship of a State. Suitable observance of the laws of nature in diet, exercise, rest, sleep, and occupation is needed for individual happiness; and ignorance of these laws is a sign of stupidity or of defective training. The physical growth and the welfare of a nation are hampered by want of organisation and by ignorance of the principles of unification. Mental suffering in individuals and nations proceeds from the ill-regulation or want of control of the passions—anger, envy, fear, greed, hate, jealousy, and lust. The tendency of the human mind is in two directions, both equally injurious. One tendency is towards indulgence in laziness and lethargy when no danger to self is expected. Hard treatment and liability to invasion are likely to generate alertness of the faculties, and are at a certain stage useful until the sense of duty is fully developed. The other tendency is a consuming sense of self-importance, as when in case of assault or of a display of selfishness by others one lets the passions get the better of the judgment, and adopts the selfishness or want of control of the aggressor. The avoidance of both extremes is essential for human well-being.

It may be open to doubt whether the manners and methods of individuals are moulded by the more prominent persons that control the destinies of the State of which they are citizens, or whether the policy of a State depends upon the culture and moral complexion of its subjects, from whom the rulers spring. Individuals in every community naturally shape their conduct by the words and acts of their fellow-citizens in the same or in a higher social stratum. If a State through its Government shows a tendency to benefit itself at the expense of others and to commit aggression upon

weaker neighbours, it may be patriotism for its citizens not to criticise the action of their Government; but the moral effect of such aggression is bound to be injurious individually and nationally. Persons that are evil-disposed or are not favoured by fortune are likely to imbibe the spirit that guides their prominent countrymen, and may deem it no wrong to rob, plunder, or ill-treat neighbours if they can manage to do so without being caught or punished. Violence, wickedness, and wrong-doing in a community cannot be extinguished so long as its Government sets a bad example in its dealings with other States and Governments. The responsibility for evil in life has thus to be laid as much upon the rulers of a State, as upon teachers, guardians, and companions of evil-doers; and States, communities, races, and individuals run the risk of demoralisation and decay more from the example and silent influence of their immoral and undutiful neighbours and associates than from the active enmity of the worst specimens of mankind. Example and influence become attractive when they hold out hopes of satisfaction of the selfish instincts, arrogance and conceit.

A curious consequence of selfishness is observable in the disposition of certain minds, not of the best or most respectable type, to indulge in criticism of neighbours and strangers with whom and with whose affairs the critics have no concern. This faculty was doubtless developed as a means of retarding progress and hindering sympathy. Criticism is beneficial and justifiable when directed upon individuals and nations that wish to serve others and take a prominent part in human affairs. It may prevent an inordinate development of complacency and a sense of infallibility; when, however, as is often the case, criticism is applied with a view simply to amuse the critic or his friends, to cause momentary merriment, or to gloat over another's faults or misfortunes, the critic ought to make sure of being himself above criticism or reproach. If he is not, he not only sets a bad example,

but also has to suffer at the hands of others treatment that cannot be amusing or profitable to himself.

The conceit that blinds the mind as far as to obliterate all sense of duty and responsibility and to make it the aim of life to humbug everybody is the highest development of selfishness, and causes ruin to self as well as others that may come within its influence. Worship of success, however desirable provided it does not openly violate prevailing ideas of morality, encourages the growth of conceit. Ever since the birth of human wisdom conceit has been declared to be created to bring about the destruction of man. When all other means of conquering a foe fail, the easiest way of compassing his overthrow is to flatter his conceit. In individual, national, and racial existence, the sense of justice becomes weakened, ideas of duty and responsibility get clouded, and even conscience itself is lost, when the mind, whether in obedience or in power, heedless of the consequences, is so dominated by conceit as to drag itself down to the lowest levels. Even if such a long vision may not be given to everybody, it ought to be easy enough to understand that arrogance and rapacity on the part of successful individuals and nations, the repudiation of treaties by States and of contracts by individuals and classes when they find themselves strong enough to violate them with impunity, and the infliction of humiliation on the unsuccessful and the humble, like turns of the wheel, perpetuate human miseries and hinder the rational development of mankind. The human mind is naturally attracted towards things that have motion and avoids what appears lifeless, yet its training in worldly selfishness leads it to favour moral and material lifelessness in neighbours unless every sign of life exists only to help its career and to support its own views and ideas. Things that appear objectionable when done by others become bearable or even laudable when done by one's own self or by one in whom one feels an interest, and things that one preaches to others to perform do not appeal to one's own sense

of duty. Indifference towards those that do not help or interest, suspicion of those that are strangers, contempt for those that cannot hurt, fear of those that can injure, grievance against those that cannot be deceived or imposed upon, annoyance with those that claim their rights, and anxiety to conciliate those from whom any benefit is expected : such are the usual attitudes of individuals and nations towards each other. And until these phases of the mind are extinguished or controlled, as they are by the few cultured types, it is impossible for mankind as a whole to get out of the stage of mixture of brutality and humanity distinguishing it and marking its separation from the divinity, which was the origin and is the end of its being.

AIDS AND IDEALS

CHAPTER II

AIDS AND IDEALS

As maladies come to test the powers of resistance and recuperation of the physical nature, and as dangers, difficulties, and troubles arise in the path of life to prove courage and constancy to eternal principles of justice and truth, so hindrances in the way of advancement or of happiness, whether springing from within one's own self or from outside, are created or encouraged by the mind through ignorance, or out of playfulness, or by association. It is easier to avoid than to surmount hindrances, but in avoiding them the chance of losing aids is risked. The question, therefore, with which life has to deal is whether it is possible to advance without any aid, or whether occasional hindrances are indirect helps to indicate the desirability of the course and to make the advance more resolute. In the course of life's progress helps are at least as often available as hindrances appear to retard it. Strength of will and disposition of the mind have then full play, and by the choice made by one's own free will one makes or mars one's fortune in life. All nature and art being a struggle of antagonistic forces, a clash is at times inevitable. It may seem to disappear with the subjugation of one of the conflicting forces, but the defeat of the vanquished force is only momentary, for it cannot be extinguished. To be able to keep steadily moving, it is necessary to recognise the unavoidable presence of opposition ; and readiness to deal with it is a source of strength.

For certain types of mind opposition provides a greater incentive to work than helpfulness. It depends, however, upon the nature and duration of the opposing force whether the resolution to persist is altogether crushed or just receives sufficient fuel to make a brighter flame. Moralists have often pointed out that carelessness, lethargy, or negligence often mars success in the work one wishes to accomplish. On careful consideration of circumstances it would be difficult to lay the blame on the proper shoulder. Who is responsible for the state of mind that hesitates or neglects when the salvation of life lies in action or advance, or what brings suitable aids and opportunities to some and to others continuous bad luck or opposition, it is beyond the power of man to comprehend. With his finite vision he attributes success to merit and failure to defects; but, whether success or failure be one's lot, it should be the aim of all reasonable minds to attempt to provide equal opportunities before worshipping success or condemning failure.

All relationship in life is delicate and based on mutual forbearance and respect, and in proportion to the strength of that feeling towards friend or foe is life's career hindered or smoothed. What may appear as a friendly force may prove a more insidious foe than an open enemy, and wisdom lies in observation and in treating a force, whether it attracts or repels, with equal coolness and serenity. The security for the smooth working of every human faculty lies in patience and in a sense of responsibility, keeping steadily in view the desired end.

As aids to life's progress the bounty of Providence in the supply of persons of culture and of genius is profuse. It is a hopeful sign of the time to note the increase in the number of cultured men and women, although genius may be rare and may not appear to flourish in every age or clime. Accomplishment and culture are signs of virility and of the useful employment of faculties and of time. They can be

attained by every mortal, though perhaps not in the same degree; and to their attainment all efforts should be directed. No one can say what favours the appearance of genius, but, like the slow building up of a magnificent structure, it may be attributed either to the influence of a previous existence or to the development of the brain in the course of several successive generations of thoroughly desirable beings, and, in addition, to the prevalence of an atmosphere in one's early life to favour its growth. This atmosphere can prevail only when there is disposition as well as leisure for thought, and when no opportunity is afforded for its vitiation by too material environments and by fondness for pleasures of the senses.

There is a general consensus of opinion among cultured and thoughtful persons as to what are the practicable ideals of life and how they can be attained. Idealism is the attempt to attain perfection in every department of life, and, even if success be impossible, to go as near it as is open to humanity. It is the chief wish of every person, high or humble, to have his present wants satisfied. With the satisfaction of those wants other wants present themselves, until life, being short, ends before the last of them are satisfied. The desire, therefore, to achieve happiness by a satisfaction of all wants is doomed to disappointment, and causes regret in one's latter years of life. But lovers of mankind and enthusiasts for human advancement feel happy not so much by the satisfaction of personal desires and ambitions as by the sight of human progress, to which during their life they have done all in their power to contribute.

The generality of mankind, perhaps, do not entertain any strong desires and only wish not to be interfered with. They have no desire to plunder or rob others, and are only anxious not to be injured or robbed. There are thus passive and active types of seekers of happiness. In the active type, ideas of happiness vary according to temperaments: some derive it from

ndulgence in pleasure, others from increase of possessions—material, moral, or intellectual—and yet others from injuring or plundering neighbours. In the case of selfish seekers, the aim of organised society has been to permit satisfaction so far as it does not go beyond the current ideas of right and wrong, and so long as a stronger force exists to prevent its exceeding due bounds.

As regards seekers of lasting and unselfish happiness, there are three main courses: (1) to keep aloof from all company, because desirable companionship is rarely available; (2) to select good companions from among those one comes in contact with; (3) to retain patience and balance of mind in the unavoidable presence of bad associates, taking care to repel any influence exercised by them.

The rules apply to books as well as to human company, and the only way to avoid evil influence is to drop a book or an associate at the first sign of evil. The risk of evil infection dispelled, the active type of human mind naturally seeks happiness—in science, to know all the forces and secrets of nature that it is possible for the human brain to comprehend or to utilise for the benefit of man; in the realm of thought, to enable the mind to indulge in the highest flights of conception; in action, to do all that lies in the power of man to accomplish; and at all times to recognise that the forces of thought and action are, in spite of apparent antagonism at times, made to help and not to thwart each other.

All lessons are learnt and all knowledge is acquired by observation, by contemplation, or by experience in the school of adversity. Minds naturally disposed towards good may at the sight of evil gain an idea of what evil is, but they are not likely to be influenced by the sight unless it is continuous and unless their faculties of contemplation and experience get benumbed enough to succumb to the continuous display. On the other hand, minds with a natural tendency to evil may require frequent or constant contact with good to change

their disposition. It is not easy to generalise as to which of the three ways of acquisition of knowledge is the most potent, but it must be evident that in each individual instance the one that is constantly encountered or frequently presented by associates for whom one has regard has the greatest chance of influencing conduct and the course of life, and of governing the formation of character. It is universally admitted that in order to exercise influence over fellow-men it is necessary to command their respect and confidence. To be able to inspire a feeling of respect the influencing force must possess the requisite qualifications and strength. The difference between various types of mind lies in the ideas as to what the qualifications are and how they can be secured.

The incentives to human action and conduct are supplied by compulsion, persuasion, or self-interest. When self-interest pulls against the interests of the community, persuasion or compulsion becomes necessary to determine one to the right path. Compulsion prevails at a primitive or rebellious stage of the mind in the case of individuals, and in societies in which the members disposed to truth and virtue are few in number. Persuasion begins to prevail in proportion as the number of virtuous members increases. In the crude stages compulsion has to be so regulated as not to rouse suspicion. The easiest and quickest way of advance is to learn from the blunders and sufferings of others ; but the advance also depends upon the faculty of observation and upon avoidance of the feeling that other people's miseries do not affect the observer. When the faculty of observation is strong and sympathetic, and is combined with an acute reasoning faculty, benefit may always be expected from experience. In the complex conditions of life, disinclination to shake off habits and traditions, or forgetfulness of the sufferings caused by previous blunders, has to be controlled in order to avoid the limitation of advance towards good.

Every one, high or humble, old or young, has the oppor-

tunity of being either useful or useless, or else positively mischievous. The more one can contribute to those around, beginning with the home, cheerfulness, happiness, peace, and security, by example as by precept, the more is one's usefulness increased. Abstention makes one useless, and also encourages the evil-disposed to try their hands in mischief. In daily life there are bound to occur events painful as well as pleasurable, and the more one succeeds in keeping one's temper serene, vision clear, and heart pure, one's capacity for usefulness is strengthened. The evils that beset life are crime, disease, and want. They are all products either of ignorance or of irrational development of self. To overcome them, long training and strict discipline are needed, and the temptations have to be removed. Individual life is short; considerable time has to be devoted to physical wants; a good deal is wasted in illness and distractions; but whatever time is available may, according to opportunities, be utilised for the pursuit of noble ideals by studious abstention in the first stage from interfering with others. If owing to the shortness of the span of life or to hindrances its great aims cannot be achieved, the efforts to gain them are still useful for one's own self and as example for neighbours and successors. Individual life, short as it is, is a phase of the corporate life; and, as this is eternal, every attempt at advance towards ideal happiness makes the path easier for those that follow.

In advance towards good, as in resistance to evil, vitality is of the utmost consequence. Its retention when possessed and its acquisition when absent can alone enable individuals in their separate or corporate capacity to be useful. The retention depends upon the ability to recuperate when exhausted, and to readjust vitality according to moral and physical changes and circumstances. In corporate existence strength and usefulness depend upon the ability, disposition, and foresight of natural leaders by birth or election, upon the timely introduction of reforms according to changing conditions, and upon the

devotion of supporters. Whether in corporate or individual life the development of the individual in all directions, and especially in directions most needed at a particular time, is of the utmost importance. Such development can take place if the hindrances are removed and means are placed at one's disposal to proceed along the right lines.

Owing to the mutability of nature it is impossible for the human mind to remain long in one condition or mood. It must either advance or recede, be happier or more miserable. As in knowledge the more one knows the more one perceives one's ignorance, the vastness of the field one has to traverse, and the need for persistence, so in every act and thought in life, whether it is the pursuit of wealth, wickedness, pleasure, happiness, or freedom, the mind is bound to wish for more or else to slacken the chase. The capacity for strenuousness depends upon the mental training, the environments, and physical endurance, the first two resting with human companions, and the last depending upon the nature of the food and upon the necessary association with the elements of material nature—fresh air, pure water, and moderate warmth. Food for the stomach and the physical frame has to be regulated according to the nature of the pursuit in life; and when one has the discernment to avoid excess and yet to have enough, one commands the needful physical and mental vigour.

All hope of a prosperous and virtuous life is centred in early education and training. At home, owing to causes indicated in Chapter I, very few are fortunate enough to obtain these advantages satisfactorily. At school they are available under suitable preceptors, but there also the hand of Satan in the shape of evil company furnishes the hindrance. Until all homes can be so purified as to make it impossible for a child to learn any evil, the seed produced even in one home is bound to contaminate scores and hundreds of other homes. Children are with guardians and preceptors for a small part of the day; their life and liking lie with children of their own age, and the example of

companions influences the mind and conduct more profoundly than the teaching of preceptors. While, therefore, inestimable boons are conferred at school, the risks of getting the seed of evil are equally great. Some forms of physical infection are now attempted to be checked, but nothing is done to stop or to counteract the poison of moral infection which a badly trained child communicates to fellow-pupils. In this as in many other matters ignorance and helplessness allied to short-sighted worldliness cause the neglect of lifelong interests, with apparent anxiety for momentary welfare. Homes will, however, never be purified until the rise of a generation that will know how to avoid, like poison, every form of evil, or until evil teaching and example from infancy become impossible.

Although a nation is composed of individuals, the development and the decay of nations proceed on different lines from those of individuals. In individuals the time for development and for the exercise of faculties for good or evil is limited. Inevitable death intervenes at a certain time to put an end to individual efforts, joys and sorrows, and to the opportunity for further development. When an individual life takes a turn towards virtue or vice it generally adheres to its course throughout life. There may be occasional instances where one may have changed one's course from virtue or from vice, but the original taste developing into habit, unless stopped by extraordinary influences, renders a reversion always probable. Individual training and development have thus to be accomplished as quickly as possible to permit the individual to attain excellence and to be useful to fellow-beings. Even after death the great deeds and thoughts of individuals live to guide and to influence successors, and herein alone lies their share in the rearing and continuation of national life. National existence differs from that of individuals in being immortal.

The importance of the prolongation, not of life, but of its vigour and virility, is perceived in its different conditions. In childhood, as in old age, helplessness is the law of nature, and

it is as difficult to express ideas and thoughts as to acquire knowledge. While, however, in age memory becomes dull and character unchangeable, in childhood memory is sharp and character pliable, so that the foundation of the usefulness of life has to be laid in that period. But the greatest work and struggle of life lie in youth, which for its trial has appetites and temptations placed in its way ; and, in proportion as those appetites are controlled and temptations resisted, life attains usefulness and emerges in glory and happiness. Like appetites and passions, germs of physical disease and mental worries exist in every individual of every race. They take effect when the ground is favourable, and when the individual loses his virility and succumbs to fear. Nervousness plays a more considerable part than even physical conditions in developing disease germs, and it plays such a part because it is based on physical selfishness. If one uses ordinary precautions and has no fear or nervousness when an infectious disease is prevalent, one would run as little risk of catching the malady as a person associating with thieves or murderers feels disposed to commit a crime so long as his mental balance remains intact.

The effect of the annoyances of life, petty or great, is of three kinds according to the temperament or training of the sufferer. In one type, the nerves are affected, and make the sufferer unhappy and miserable. The nervous type cannot directly injure others, and regards fellow-creatures of a different type as generally mischievous and wicked, but by its passive suffering it encourages wicked people to more wrong-doing. In a second type, annoyance develops passion and a disposition to retaliate, and to treat every stranger brusquely, if not roughly. The second type is better than the first because it avoids personal unhappiness and by its faculty of retaliation and defiance keeps wickedness in check. The third and ideal type is recognised by an unruffled temper under annoyance or provocation, which enables it to defend itself and to fight hard when occasion arises. It never forgets that others are made

like itself, always retains consideration for and a dignified bearing towards tormentors as well as friends, and does not imagine offence when none is intended. It has charity and toleration for people because it knows that the temper is apt to get soured in proportion to the bad luck, disappointment, and failure in life. Its great attribute is that, whether fighting or fraternising, whether dealing with uncouth or with polite surroundings, it retains perfect composure and serenity. In addition to personal happiness it secures for itself physical health, and by example and demeanour advances the happiness of fellow-beings.

Such maxims as "Familiarity breeds contempt," or "Distance lends enchantment," or "No hero is a hero to his valet," although in everyday life they play a considerable part in human intercourse, are not proved by the conduct and bearing of true heroes. Really good and great men and women, who have nothing to conceal for the sake of popularity, are often kindly to and familiar with their humbler brethren and secure the greatest devotion and loyal attachment from their associates and nearest friends. In such cases merit has its reward, and not the display of superficial qualities, which often render men popular in life by winning arts of concealment, of flattery, and of mock presentation. Distance in certain conditions of life may cause some enchantment, but generally it also generates suspicion. The effect in either case is not due at all to the distance, but to the suspicious or confiding nature of the mind that contemplates it. Familiarity is, doubtless, not desirable at all times even with one's best friends, or kith and kin, as the mind needs at times freedom and rest from everybody and everything, as in sleep it needs freedom and rest from itself. It is human nature to be tired of things when they cloy—of the best food, the best books, the best clothes, and of the best of wives and husbands—not from a desire to do without them, but from the same cause that produces a feeling of fatigue from work, weather, or

worry. Even when they are not the best, a hesitation is felt to part with them, because others that might take their place might, after all, easily be worse. It is, however, a singular human instinct, not shared by the animals, which leads the mind never to be tired of one's own children. It may be because children cannot be replaced at will, like other necessities of life, or because the natural feeling that distinguishes mankind from the brutes makes one cleave to one's flesh and blood, to whom one has given birth and whom one has cherished in a helpless state, or because one does not mind being seen even at weak moments by children, who deem parents, whatever may be their faults and weaknesses, to be perfect beings, and who would not babble about them to others. This relationship proves that it is possible so to train the mind as to tend to produce the feeling of forbearance in a wider circle. Among strangers familiarity, which is possible only when there is no bar of absolute prejudice, will be found to breed tolerance oftener than contempt.

In case of difference of opinion between good friends on some vital point, it often happens that they fall out, become cold to each other, and even cease to be on speaking terms. As very slight causes lead nations to war, slaughter, and waste of resources, so among individuals misunderstandings and absence of explanation generate enmity between acquaintances and friends. Animosity, bitterness, or enmity has often its root in ignorance, misunderstanding, want of communication, and silence. Patient, tolerant, and well-bred persons recognise the difficulty of dissipating ignorance or prejudice, but do not increase bitterness by indulging in rudeness. Others that have not the patience, good nature, or breeding foment animosity by unsympathetic conduct, deliberate avoidance of knowledge and of opportunity for explanation, and, in cases when they can do so with impunity, by resort to abuse and oppression. There are yet others that take pleasure in criticism, sometimes good-natured and at other times

venomous. Open criticism when just and timely may often be beneficial, and is certainly better than backbiting, secret mischievousness, or physical violence. Just criticism needs brains, and in proportion as the mind advances from the primitive stage the use of physical violence diminishes and brains come more into play. The object of criticism must, however, be worth something to excite the critical or envious faculty. By losing the balance of mind on provocative criticism one plays into the hands of the critic, and the highest wisdom consists in showing that one is not hurt when hit. Criticism to be just should be above any taint of selfishness. It is a great attribute of the mind to possess the faculty of discernment from which the art of criticism springs. If everything, material or moral, which is presented to view, could be analysed, criticised, and scanned with coolness and deliberation so as to find out its beneficiality or mischievousness, it would not take long for the mind to discover the road to happiness and peace. Prejudices and predilections have to be conquered, and a generous analysis and criticism with a view to discover good qualities and failings can alone train the mind to receive and absorb good, and to advance its welfare as well as human friendliness. In such analysis or criticism one cardinal maxim has to be borne in mind. Diversity being nature's law, one cannot find another face or mind like one's own. The beauty of nature lies in variety, and the strength of human existence, individual, national, and racial, its concord, happiness, humanity, and peace, are promoted by observing variety in a sympathetic spirit, and by laying greater stress on similarities and identities than on differences. Everything that unifies is strengthening, and anything that disintegrates brings the poison of decay and death.

Fair comment without malice or intent to injure is needed at every step in the life of individuals, institutions, and States. Want of it generates self-sufficiency, and an infusion of venom

rouses passion and a spirit of defiance. Just criticism is, however, difficult to secure. Friends are apt to be partial, to condone defects, and to admire encouragingly failings without trying to mend them, while strangers by exceeding the bounds of propriety and justice fail to convey benefit by criticism. There are doubtless among both friends and strangers just and generous minds whose advice and comment are meant for good, but they get swamped in the vast mass of injustice and partiality. This unfortunate state of affairs is remediable only by the best education and training, and will improve with the diffusion of culture. Till then, unfair and venomous criticism any more than cruel and unfeeling conduct and disposition cannot be extinguished, and acts and words will continue to harass existence, bordering upon or overstepping the line of lawlessness, as judicial authorities may decide.

A distinction ought, however, to be made in the gravity of offences according as they are perpetrated against person or property. Offences and crimes by their nature require differential treatment; and, while nothing should be done to slacken the idea of the heinousness of all wrong-doing, petty offences may be stopped by gentler methods than are needed for crimes that are dangerous to society and to the State. Petty offences are often a nuisance, especially when committed by juvenile offenders, for if in that case they become habitual, they tend by example as well as by commission to prove as injurious as more heinous offences. They may be easily prevented by providing each child from birth with a suitable environment and training. The State that fails to make such provision abets the commission of crime by its citizens, and whatever may be its military strength it is bound to become weaker with the degeneracy of its people. Social legislation, as much as defensive organisation, is a matter of absolute necessity for the welfare of States, and constructive social legislation has to commence by the prohibition of

practices that are injurious to man. It is a paternal duty to rear children so as to make them physically, morally, and intellectually worthy members of society. It is equally the duty of the State to do all it can to make each succeeding generation of its citizens better and happier than its predecessor.

Revenge is sweet to petty minds, but the difficulty is to keep it within bounds so as not to demoralise the avenger. The great truth cannot be too often or too strongly proclaimed that, when harm is done to another, whether in aggression or in vengeance, it hurts the doer morally as much as it may hurt the sufferer physically. States discourage suicide and punish attempts to commit it, but the practical way to stop it is to remedy the evils that lead to its commission. Murderers and other criminals when caught are not permitted to end their existence, although such ending may be as beneficial for the criminals as for their fellow-men. They are carefully locked up and nursed in order that the State may have the satisfaction of revenge. Criminals, when they are not permitted to commit suicide, should be offered a chance of reformation. In an advanced but despotically governed Continental State, where in all departments of life from philosophy to war so much impetus has been given to the attainment of excellence, open-air reformatories have been established for the reclamation of criminals, and the methods adopted for making them good citizens are by teaching them to earn an honest livelihood and by marrying them to honest citizens. Whatever may be thought of the latter method, there can be no doubt that sacrifice is the secret of greatness, success, or usefulness in life. Individually, the sacrifice of joys, pleasures, and selfishness leads to power or saintliness. Nationally, the capacity for sacrifice of a large number leads to prominence. On the other hand, individual and national position gained by birth or wisdom is slowly and surely lost when such position leads to selfish indulgence. The virtue of sacrifice is observable in acquiring and in giving up whatever is worth having in life.

Until a high sense of duty, in which self is forgotten except as an instrument for the good of other selves, is imbibed and governs every thought and act of life, human action is moulded by two fears—fear inspired by an unseen force, which is called theology or conscience, and fear of law or punishment by fellow-creatures that control organised society. Where conduct is governed by fear of punishment or by hope of reward it is swayed by self; and so long as it is swayed by self, it is unreliable, since the possible absence of punishment or of reward may lead to waywardness. For advancing the temporary interests of self, resort may be had to secret methods, by which exposure or punishment may be evaded. The uses to which theology has been put among all races do not encourage the hope that religion will succeed in inspiring mankind with a high sense of duty. It generally becomes the instrument of despots and priests to assert sway over fellow-men. By some it is used as a hypocritical pretence and a cloak for the concealment of evil designs to benefit self at the expense of others by false representation of one's character and intentions. Theology, whether idolatrous or professedly spiritual, dissociated from example and tradition, has influenced for good comparatively few minds, because theology is the highest philosophy, and as such is comprehensible only by a restricted class. For the average mind it degenerates to bigotry or superstition, on account of the inability of the ordinary man to conceive a divinity different from his own ideas. Every religion, therefore, although when first promulgated it may be essentially spiritual and unselfish, has degenerated into some form of idolatry, because it cannot change human nature and induce the mind to discard from its aims of life the idea of material joys. On the other hand, it is noticeable that, when material considerations are wholly expunged and spirituality is alone made the basis of existence, the individual or race that does so becomes the prey of materially strong and selfish forces. No religion that has

attempted to influence human conduct, therefore, has succeeded in achieving or retaining an absolute ideal of purity or spirituality. Such achievement or retention can be expected only when both hope of reward and fear of punishment are wholly cast out of the mind, and when a high sense of duty, not associated as at present with repayment in money or kind, impels every thought and act of life.

Human nature may be divided into two types : one may be described as honourable or dutiful, trying to discharge duties under all conditions to the best of its ability according to its lights ; the other dishonourable or slavish, acting as others prompt and evading duties except under the pressure of fear, force, or coercion. When the two types are blended in one nature, as may sometimes be the case, the usefulness of that nature depends upon the success with which it can control the baser type. The same may be said of nations whose usefulness is advanced in proportion as the better type controls national policy.

Every institution depends upon human forces to attain success, and upon foresight to provide against likely dangers ; and its continued success rests with the instruments chosen and the policy pursued by them. In course of nature the instruments undergo change, but the policy of idealism must be adhered to if the organism is to retain its usefulness. Adherence to principles under all conditions is not an easy matter. The promptings of self-interest cause a deviation, and, when these are controlled, the wail of the advocates of worldliness, pointing at every step to the impracticability of noble ideals, renders hesitation inevitable. Open and glaring inconsistency is a characteristic of the timid and reactionary mind. Individuals and nations struggling for fair play, fortune, and freedom have discouragement and ridicule thrown on their efforts, and generally receive scant courtesy, if not abuse, for their toils. When they succeed, the manners of the opponents undergo a change, at first with a shaking of heads and with

prophecies of evil, which become less with lapse of time, until at length the butt of ridicule becomes strong enough to be safe from harm and to receive the homage of the evil prophets and previous enemies. An apt example is presented in the case of Italy. One has to peruse the writings in the Press and the speeches of politicians from 1859 until quite recent times to know the prophetic instincts of the pessimistic mind. The people that were held to be incapable of unity or of the serious business of life have but recently been receiving congratulations from all quarters on the Jubilee of the independence and unification of their country. One would think that after such a failure prophecies and detraction would be less profuse, but they continue, in order perhaps to provide the incentive to races and individuals to improve their condition and to falsify the prophets. Statesmanship has got into the habit of indulging in a great deal of hypocrisy, of Macchiavelism, of professions of altruism with practice of contrary principles. Hence, any attempt made by even a wise and progressive nation to influence other and more backward nations is regarded with suspicion as a cloak for ulterior designs of annexation and commercial profit. There are now in every race and country numerous individuals with intelligence and foresight enough to know what is desirable and justifiable, and what leads unawares step by step to undesirable or unforeseen consequences. Such consequences are generally the product of the inability of the central authority to control distant subordinates, and of these subordinate authorities to control compatriots who have not developed much of altruism and to whom anything beyond the interests of self is unknown.

Control is necessary when selfishness prevails. Unnecessary or excessive control is apt to generate moral lethargy, and stops the development of character, self-reliance, and thrift. Authority as representing the interests of the State, which consists of the whole people, has doubtless to secure its safety, but, as the permanent safety of a State depends

upon the nature and character of its citizens, the aim and duty of authority must be to encourage the growth of better citizens, healthier in body and mind. If the encouragement is possible by moral persuasion, this is more desirable and helpful than compulsion; but compulsion seems to become necessary with the perversion of the idea of freedom, which may lapse into inaction in the combat with disease, ignorance, and poverty—the problems with which individually and collectively every State has to deal for its own security and welfare.

Authority, whether created by birth, election or selection, ought to possess absolute power so long as it has the divine attributes of calmness and impartiality and the ability to avoid complacency resulting from adulation and power. It is as necessary that authority should be obeyed as that it should possess the ability and impartiality that command obedience and respect. The qualifications needed for the government of men are not confined to oligarchy or democracy, each system having its advantages and dangers. The dangers appertaining to both systems are likely to diminish as education and sense of duty spread among the ruled as well as the rulers, and, as obedience is secured not by fear but by interest, love, and respect. Owing to possession of the infinite capacity of conception and decision, it is difficult for different minds in the absence of respect or sympathy to view things in the same light, but it ought to be possible to train them to a standard by which differences may be minimised and inconsiderate acts and words may be avoided.

Efficiency in the public service, as in all other human affairs, is best secured by control. Should there be no control, or should control not be exercised for some time, an individual or a department which has long been regularly doing a certain class of acts comes to regard the doing as a prerogative, and resents the re-exertion of control as unlawful or mischievous interference. Too much control, on the other hand, cramps

originality and initiative. To avoid one evil there is risk of falling into the other, and the only way to minimise the risk is so to cultivate the mind and balance forces that control may be exercised without a feeling of interference, and work may be regularly performed without a sense of prerogative.

In an existence intrinsically based on self as separate from others, principally owing to its birth and end not being shared by others, it is vain to expect that its impulses can be entirely selfless. Its selfishness, however, can be made as little provocative and pugnacious as possible by a course and system of training from infancy based on the control, and not on the eradication, of self. Human intercourse is by tradition based too much on fear and violence as instruments of securing peace for humane methods to have fair play. Selfishness becomes dangerous, not so much for its own sake, as for the tactics needed to advance its interests. In the home, in the schoolroom, in legislative and administrative chambers, in barracks, even in what is described as the house of God, tactics for the assertion of self, when self is enthroned in power and has force to back it, consist in the propagation of fear and in resort to violence or deception as the quickest and easiest means for its vindication. The impatience of the human mind, generated and developed by consciousness of the limited span of its existence, cannot brook the delay of persuasion, whose action, although sure and lasting, is slow ; and consequently it has recourse to methods that, when resorted to by persons in humble, oppressed, and weak positions, are condemned by those that are entrenched in the citadel of power and prominence. In one case the violence is open because its perpetrators fancy themselves to be secure ; in the other the violence is nursed in secrecy, with occasional ebullitions according to opportunity and the strength of the instinct of self-preservation. If the selfishness of self is to be made selfless, resort to violence or to deception in any shape or form, whether in power or in subjection, must be discarded from human relationship.

The more prominent the position of an individual or nation becomes, the more urgent becomes the need to forget and efface oneself and to become a general friend and guardian. The best rulers of men are persons whose sympathies are the least limited, and who can most perceive the unity of existence and the identity of interests of fellow-citizens. Whether as husband or wife, or father, or mother, or child, the person that can merge existence in the related entity becomes a model. So in service or in mastery one becomes ideal in proportion as one forgets one's own interests for those of the related object. As in personal relationship position with regard to every matter in life determines one's way of looking at it, in the matter of law the point of view is regulated according as one has to frame or to administer or to obey the enactment. In the matter of money it depends upon whether one has to pay or to receive. In the matter of authority it makes a difference when one has to be subject to it or to exercise it. Thus in every condition of life the view from different points cannot possibly be the same; and wisdom consists, not in trying to abolish differences, but in recognising the various points of view and in adjusting them without favour or partiality. In an existence based on variety it may not be possible to assimilate antagonistic ideas and characteristics; but the assimilation or harmonisation of different and unfamiliar conditions, although difficult, may in course of time be secured. Wise blending of the ideals and virtues of different individuals and races ought, like the blending of the body and flavour of various kinds of tea, produce a happy mixture. Similarly a combination of the wickedness of various types may produce a monster of iniquity. In order to be effective, however, the blend must be moral; attempts at physical amalgamation are bound to fail, and obliteration of one set of differences will result in the birth of another set. When one individual, race, or class comes in contact with another, unless there is absolute repulsion on both sides, a gradual assimilation according to the

influence exercised on the imagination cannot be avoided. The mind, according to its sympathies or antipathies, encourages or discourages amalgamation. It is possible for finite beings to advance or to retard events of which they are themselves the product, but it is not in the power of man to prevent what nature ordains or to secure what nature refuses. Unnatural attempts at resistance or compliance merely aggravate misery.

Of culture, good manners, knowledge, wealth, wisdom, or any other valuable or desirable attribute or possession, every individual or nation is in duty bound to give to others what may not make the giver feel poorer or in any way a sufferer. Unostentatious charity and generosity ennoble the giver and benefit the taker, because both parties are units of the human family, whose better impulses are fostered by example and precept. Charity may sometimes be given to unworthy objects and thus wasted ; but it is better for the giver's happiness and sense of duty to continue to give even after meeting with disappointment in some cases than to harden his own heart and deprive the deserving ones. Disappointments are unavoidable in the case of material gifts so long as culture does not become universal, and culture can spread only if principles of socialism are applied more to moral qualifications than to material possessions, which if evenly distributed may produce various evils. A feeling of antagonism has always to be avoided, as such a feeling can lead only to attempts at deception or unlawful possession, while confidence, although sometimes misplaced, is bound to rouse the kindly instincts. A feeling of unity is generated in proportion to the amount of sympathy, equal risks and dangers, and identity of interest. The sense of unity is fostered also by a perception of the perils and risks which pervade life at every step. In wealth is the peril of loss and robbery ; in power, the risk of intoxication and consequent injustice or oppression ; in poverty, the want of opportunity for physical and mental welfare as well as the risk of jealousy and pettiness ; in health, the peril of carelessness proceeding from

conceit, and consequent risk of disease ; in illness, the waste of time and physical energy as well as mental despondency ; in knowledge, the peril of contempt for ignorance and dissatisfaction for not knowing more ; in ignorance, the peril of listlessness and of leading a life of animalism ; in freedom, the peril of license ; in dependence, the risk of tyranny ; in family life, the peril of unhappiness ; in single life, the want of attachment. The only condition in which there is no peril is boundless sympathy, sense of duty, and toleration.

Designing people find it easier to secure popularity and position by debasing the mind, both individual and national, by appeals to hatred, jealousy, and vanity, and by rousing evil passions by branding strangers and foreign races with inferiority and treating them with distrust and suspicion. This game may temporarily succeed at home, but, as it is played by persons of other races as well, it fosters racial animosities and injures mankind. Blind is the patriotism that seeks to praise or benefit one's own family, class, or race, by exciting prejudices and unkind treatment, for which sooner or later suffering has to be undergone. Such patriotism would be sane as could combine with watchfulness for national interests consideration for the interests of other nations.

Patriotism may be of two kinds ; both are laudable, but one may injure and undermine national character and moral principles. For anxiety to secure temporary advantage, one phase of patriotism may be called worldly patriotism, which is to nurse the conviction that a fellow-countryman can do no wrong, and that one's country cannot do anything that is open to blame or criticism. To shut one's eyes and ears when a crime is committed, or to ignore an evil that may have existed for a long time and to proclaim which may be an admission disparaging to one's country, may be prudent in face of the inimical foreigner ; but it cannot fail to strike at altruism and to lead to a weakening of the moral fibre of a nation. The other kind of patriotism is ideal : it does not consider temporary

gain or loss, but wishes one's country and countrymen to possess all that is best and most virtuous in human faculties and endowments, and neither to do nor to have anything that may enable a foreigner to point the finger of scorn at them. To expose wrong-doing and evil in order that every vestige of poison may be eradicated from the national character and ideas, and that the country's name may never be tarnished or dishonoured—this is the way by which ideal patriotism may be attained.

Patriotism may also be either sane or insane. It is sane patriotism to try or wish to place one's country in the most favourable position to attain the best gifts and virtues in order that it may exercise the greatest influence in advancing human happiness. The insanity comes in when questionable or unjust methods are adopted or advocated for the purpose of securing the position. Desirable or praiseworthy ends, if attained by undesirable means, cannot be free from blame, and the poison of injustice by which their attainment may be secured is bound to mould their character and the fortunes of the individual or nation that employs it. Perhaps it is for this reason that no nation, and very few individuals, can occupy long a dominant position or can exercise a wholly beneficent influence. It is no valid excuse to insinuate that some wrong-doing is justifiable when all are more or less wrong-doers, since that excuse causes the lapse from good manners and high principles that perpetuates human miseries. In international dealings it is deemed patriotic for a nation desiring expansion and greatness to rob other nations of their possessions. If the desire is praiseworthy the robbery must be just, since new possessions and new worlds cannot be created for the satisfaction of ambitious and rising nationalities. Pious and irreproachable sentiments are often publicly expressed by ministers and rulers of every great State and their supporters in the Press about the benefits of peace and how it may be secured. Those expressions are the loudest in nations that have most to lose by

war or invasion. With the pious wishes, however, the invasion, conquest, or profitable annexation of weaker States is never missed, and consequently preparations for war and slaughter on a gigantic scale proceed apace in every State according to its means, while its prominent men do lip-service to the gospel of peace. If the wish to secure a general cessation of war, robbery, and massacre were sincere, one of the following courses would be adopted:—

(1) Each Power to give back such territories as it has annexed if the people of such territories do not wish to continue under the rule of the annexing State; that is, a general grant of Home Rule to all subject or protected governments that desire it.

(2) All States to enter into an agreement binding each to refer any difference or dispute with another to the joint arbitration of representatives of the rest of the States, and at the same time to stop the rivalry in armaments.

(3) To have a combination of the most virtuous and powerful nations to act as the police for the control of wrongdoing rulers of mankind.

Failing these courses, the only other alternative is for the strongest existing Power to send an ultimatum to every State in turn that is improving its offensive strength on land or on sea, and to crush it before it becomes dangerous. This course can be effective only if the attacking Power is morally as well as physically strong enough to support the consequences of success. If it is not, it will soon either weaken itself by conceit and self-indulgence or provoke a combination that will chastise its arrogance and destroy its prominence. In national as in individual affairs the truth has to be recognised that nature cannot stand still—that where progress towards excellence ceases decay must follow. It should also be apparent that wars and their dire results may be avoided and peace maintained, not merely by making victory certain, which means competition in armaments, but by more extended

facilities of international intercourse, by a more vivid realisation of the great fact of commercial interdependence, and by recognising the preservation of peace as a necessity of daily life.

Individuals and nations quarrel and fight when one insults or provokes another. The provocation generally proceeds from self-interest—from a desire or hope to gain something from the party provoked. The desire springs either from a consciousness of superior strength and ability to force the other to submission, or from miscalculation of the strength of either side. In such miscalculation the aggressor has to suffer for his action. In the case of individuals, law, justice, and police exist in well-organised communities to stop aggression and wrong. Until the disposition to self-aggrandisement is extinguished in every mind, some force or other remedy is indispensable for the peace and security of every individual. In the case of nations, superiority in organisation and armaments will continue for some time to be the basis of security, and a consciousness of such superiority will alone enable nations to promote peacefully their advancement and to command the respect of other nations. So long, however, as mankind worships material success and applauds gain made by superior force, provocation at a suitable opportunity may always be looked for. In communities progress depends upon the diminution of the number of wrong-doers. Among nations the gradual cessation of provocation may be expected to come about when several nations are equally strong and can combine to stop wrong-doing by another, but the evils of insult, provocation, and war will be extinguished only when all nations through their rulers become virtuous, or when by a redistribution of national boundaries and forces an equilibrium of strength is effected. In national as in individual relationship, whenever any material interests are involved, there is a disposition for each party to get as much as possible out of the other, and no sense of decency or of altruism restrains the attempt to cripple

or smother the existence of each other, the attempt being qualified by prudence to guard oneself from risks of defeat or loss if the other is too strong to be crushed. Even in these more enlightened days, how few rulers yet appreciate the glaring fact that the more prosperous other nations are the more they are able and willing to buy the products of foreign industry and to supply the needs of foreign customers ! Where, however, no material interests are concerned, individuals as well as nations, in comparatively advanced or backward communities, are capable of showing consideration for each other. It proves the evil consequence of the predominance of material concerns, and the possibility of leading a saner existence when there is a higher moral life.

Patriotism is thus often abused by the domination of self and the disposition to plunder, rob, and tyrannise a weaker neighbour, and to conciliate or to give in to the stronger. When this abuse is practised, especially by prominent nations, or by individuals speaking in their name, others attempt to imitate such conduct ; and, as no success based on selfishness can be permanent, general distrust and struggle for mastery ensue, leading to the diversion of energies from the paths of progress to those of destruction. Although sometimes thus abused, patriotism is one of the great attributes of the human mind. Developed along the right lines, it leads to the control of selfishness and to the unification of mankind. True patriotism consists in advancing the interests of the Fatherland by all honourable methods, in abstaining from acts that stain its good name, and in recognising the right and the duty of all mankind to possess and to exercise the virtue, however much its scope in particular cases may be limited by artificial boundaries.

Like patriotism, there are other virtues that play an important part in human affairs. The more important may be defined or described. Thus, goodness consists in doing good and being kind to others irrespective of relationship or

neighbourhood, physical or moral, without the slightest tinge of selfishness, and without the shadow of a wish for fame or reward. Dutifulness consists in the discharge of the business in hand, entrusted by God or by man, by accident of birth or of environment or of training, to the best of one's power, without hope or wish for gain in any shape. Religion consists in the perception of unity and in feeling for all fellow-creatures as one feels for one's own self. Greatness consists in inability to take advantage of others' weakness or helplessness as well as in doing all in one's power to raise the weak and to help the sick and oppressed. Nobleness consists in unconsciousness of high birth or position and in avoidance of meanness and selfishness.

These virtues are the most precious possessions and the noblest heritage of man. Many lay claim to them, but few act up to them, especially when adverse forces, and notably temporary self-interest, arise to try their constancy. When their edge is blunted and their free action is interfered with for momentary gain or other worldly consideration, their possessor proves untrue to himself and becomes an enemy of his species. It is ordinary human nature to deem right whatever is done by one that is beloved or trusted, and to find fault with or adversely criticise acts done by others not enjoying one's affection or confidence. Training has to be so directed as to lead to a general feeling of affection and confidence, or at any rate so as not to display a want of them until substantial occasion for distrust arises.

The care of self has to be attended to, because its development is necessary for service to its brethren and because it cannot otherwise be expected to do much good to other selves. In this view alone the care of self is justifiable, not to advance oneself at the expense of others, but to render oneself fit to serve others, to set a good example to others, and to induce the backward brethren to advance as well. Superior persons may sneer at and suspect others that appear strange merely

because they are not familiar, but human animosities and miseries can be counteracted and allayed only by a resolute endeavour to acquire knowledge of other individuals than one's own self, of other classes than one's own class, and of other races than one's own race. Individual, national, racial, and class prejudices and suspicions become less in proportion to the increase in the number of cultured and generous individuals who are disposed to extend to fellow-men and women charity and toleration, and whose pride of virtuous self is strong enough to resist the insidious encroachments that the uncultured section of their fellows are always bent upon making. Mere consciousness and care of one's own good intentions and disposition are, however, not enough to counteract evil in the world. Passive qualifications, although far better than active mischievousness, cannot diminish evil. Goodness must be active, vigilant, and pugnacious to be able to struggle successfully with the pushful instruments of Satan.

There are only two ways of dealing with evil : to keep away from it, and to fight it. The vast mass are either apathetic, or else they connive at its existence in order indirectly to benefit by it. Unless evil in the shape of ignorance, antipathy, or prejudice existed, reactionary ideas could not flourish. Hence it is the aim of the advocates of privilege to foster conditions that set up barriers between individuals, classes, and races. Those that are impatient of evil are either despondent because it cannot be controlled, and, being despondent, deem their hope of escape from infection to lie in avoiding it, or else disposed to keep at such a distance from it as not to be influenced by it in any way. There are also enthusiastic reformers whose idealist crusade leads them to a continual struggle to overcome it. In the first flush of reforming enthusiasm the crusade prospers, but constant contact with evil, even as an enemy, has the inevitable effect of cooling ardour. Good can never meet evil without being

influenced by it; hence desponding idealists keep themselves aloof from demoralising conditions. High-bred aristocrats and gentle people keep away from those whose manners are not to their liking, or in attempting to influence them their own high-breeding undergoes an unfavourable change. Similarly, religious and virtuous souls find safety in keeping aloof from the irreligious and vicious. Such segregation may save the good from contamination, but it cannot exterminate evil. A strenuous and sustained struggle, with the single aim to overcome evil and with a resolution not to dally with it, is the only means of leading towards the goal of ideal happiness. Nations that have attained greatness or prosperity must likewise for their own security either keep altogether aloof from backward races or else direct their efforts to raise them to their own level; otherwise the contact must inevitably undermine their own greatness and prosperity.

The human mind, from its birth in the world and its early condition of helplessness, learns to value and to wish for companionship. As it grows with its physical frame, it finds that desirable company is difficult to get. Some start with their nature so qualified that they come to like bad or undesirable company better than none; but the more thoughtful grow to regard company as fit for avoidance unless it is desirable, or unless it can be influenced for good. In the first place, life is too short and time is too precious to be wasted on vapid companionship or inane social functions when it can be utilised for the benefit of oneself and of those whose lives one influences. In the next place, every human action being based on selfishness, no one cares to associate with or do anything for another unless there is something to gain by such association or conduct. In the third place, good and desirable company is available at times, but few are endowed with the capacity to confer moral benefit by association. In the fourth place, a high standard of life, when gained, finds a difficulty in securing congenial company, and runs the risk

of degeneracy by association with inferiors; hence it chooses to lead a life of solitary and selfish bliss.

Comparatively desirable company, which is a mixture of virtue and worldliness, is often available, and those who feel unhappy without company would do well to associate with companions in whom the virtuous element is more in evidence than worldliness; but good books and the thoughts of great minds of the past are the beacons for the existing and future generations, and all available time—that is, time that can be spared from work for livelihood and other daily needs—cannot be better employed than in association with the minds that have left great ideas and thoughts for the benefit of fellow-beings. Cheap printing has brought masterpieces of thought, speech, and writing within the reach of all, but it has also produced a mass of trashy literature, which plays havoc with the growing intelligence of large classes. Whether the taste for cheap masterpieces will eventually outgrow the taste for trash depends upon the direction that the infant mind receives from its preceptor. Men of commanding genius are said to be getting rarer, but careful inquiry will probably disclose that the number has increased with the growth of intelligence and thoughtfulness, while it is not so easy for any genius to obtain recognition as in days when geniuses were few.

Unless one has a genius for coining new words and phrases that come to be engrafted in a language, every word and phrase used now must have been used by others. Every thought of every moralist and idealist must likewise have been of the same category, if not exactly of the same type. The principles of socialism may with advantage be applied to such products of the brain as have no material gain attached to them, and such products may be diffused as widely as possible. Thus alone can knowledge, moral ideas, and sense of duty become universal among mankind. Individuals do not at birth receive equal personal endowments, and it is the duty

of every well-organised society to provide all with equal opportunities so that their moral possessions may be fostered and their wants made up in order to advance their own happiness and the welfare of the community to which they belong.

There are two main incentives to man's conduct in life. One is to secure personal ease, influence, and happiness; the other, to provide for his children and more remote descendants what is valued in life. The two are not equally potent in every nature. The first influences the average man's acts more than the second, because children are valued less for their own sake than because they bring sentimental joy to self in caring for helpless creatures for whose birth one is responsible, and because they are felt to be resources for and helps in one's old age. There is also the idea that the issue is expected to bring honour to or to perpetuate the memory of their progenitor. In the anxiety to secure personal comfort man often mars or sacrifices the interests of his issue. Long foresight into the distant future is a divine attribute and is not the possession of every creature, especially when such creature is swayed not by intelligence, which is the special endowment of man, but by the appetites and physical wants, which he has in common with animals. Every one with the figure and attributes of human beings may, however, be expected to possess ordinary prevision, and, while in some matters displaying anxiety for future generations, to mould his conduct in accordance with the knowledge that all that one values so much ends with the dissolution of one's own physical existence.

There are three possible views of life. First, the ancient philosophical view that ascribes existence to the wish of the mind to taste the joys and sorrows of the material world. According to this view, life is a stage on a long journey that leads either to a higher, nobler, and purer existence, until it is merged in the eternal, or else to a lower level, until it is dragged down to gross and unintelligent animalism. So long

as its aims and aspirations are a mixture of generosity and selfishness, it continues to exist in various shapes. Secondly, the general worldly view conceives the spiritual part of life to begin and end with the physical existence ; which, being based on self, may legitimately direct its efforts to make that existence as pleasant as possible. The further the distance from self, the greater is the suspicion or animosity felt towards it, and what is not likely to be useful is pushed away. Thirdly, the modern cultured view regards the beginning and the end of life as incomprehensible, and considers that its interest and duty lie in making itself good and useful for its own happiness as well as in setting a desirable example to others. National life prospers under the third view, especially as with a continuous succession of good and noble minds it may be indefinitely prolonged.

There are two ways whereby the highest interests and lasting happiness may be secured. Both combined would make human existence divine, and one of the two is absolutely necessary for even passable happiness. They are (1) a high sense of duty from which all thought of self is banished, and (2) a perception of the essential identity of interest and sentiment of all mankind producing in the mind an unalterable conviction of the unity of life. Such unity is felt by almost everybody in connection with one's kith and kin, or the nearest and dearest in family life. Widened, it culminates in an all-embracing love, in which every element of passion and self-interest is extinguished. This love in practical life enjoys complete purity of thought and action, sets a lofty example to others in matters of duty, and at every suitable opportunity attempts to influence those that come in contact with it. In national life, it operates in assimilating and blending all that is good and virile in every age and clime, or in a complete exclusiveness and separation from undesirable contagion. Individuals, when they attain that stage, can from prominent positions influence an ever-widening circle of fellow-men, unless they deliberately choose

to lead a quiet and secluded life ; and such influence continually advances the position, status, and welfare of the community of which they become the natural and legitimate leaders. Nations under such leaders, being impelled by natural law to influence other and more backward nations, find themselves in the position of conquerors and guides, and embark upon what has come to be known as domination. Like leadership in a community, a dominant position among nations may be conducive to the greatest good for mankind, provided that success does not generate complacency, and that the sense of duty combined with a consciousness of individual mortality dominates every act and thought.

Domination may thus be virtuous or vicious, and worldly or a mixture of virtue and vice. Virtuous domination may be found in the hearts of a few most gifted geniuses, but, as the instruments through which they have to act are not so sane, and as their successors are rarely such geniuses, virtuous imperialism, though it may appear at times, cannot be permanent under existing human conditions. Vicious imperialism has been the rule in national relationship in the past history of mankind, with the result that it has enabled a few individuals or a few successive generations to oppress fellow-men, demoralising the possessor of power by forgetfulness of his evanescence and degrading the peoples over whom the power was exercised. The mixture of virtue and vice is becoming more common, with the awakening of human consciousness, and with the existence of rivals that have to vie with each other, like rival suitors for the hand of beauty, in making themselves attractive. When with possession the desire or the need for attractiveness is retained, and the virtuous part predominates and shows a tendency to become more virtuous—not to stand still or to recede from virtue—imperialism prospers and advances towards complete success and human welfare. When, however, vice begins to subdue virtue, the relationship becomes more and more undesirable, and causes while it lasts unhappiness

to both partners. Imperialism, like matrimony, is desirable and beneficial when both sides possess soundness of body and mind, so as not to be liable to break down under strain, and are equally anxious to raise a healthy and virile progeny that will be an honour to the parents and know how to secure their own happiness.

Imperialism is never properly defined or explained by its advocates, because they find any definition or explanation unsuited to the purpose for which they advocate it. If it means the domination of one or more individuals over the rest of a community, whether such domination rests on force or on selection, it must always exist in every organised and orderly agglomeration of men and women. A few men in every age and clime gain the opportunity, or are gifted with special attributes and capacity, to rule over their fellow-men. The rule becomes beneficial when those in authority are dutiful and unselfish, and a community prospers when a continuous series of such men is maintained. History has not yet proved any *race* to be imperial: had there ever been such a race, it would not have declined, decayed, or ceased to be imperial. The weakness or the interested purpose of the claim of racial superiority is evident from the fact that in a so-called imperial race the claim of every person to be imperial is not conceded. Should a general admission of imperial capacity be made, the class or the few families for whose monopoly of power imperialism is claimed would have to give way to humbler countrymen, many of whom would be ready to do the work of imperialism and to discharge the duty of rulers at a much less cost than is incurred by the employment of the existing privileged order. Such a state of things cannot be congenial to the advocates of imperialism, whose insincerity is proclaimed by themselves when they speak of their countrymen as imperial, and when they deny to the humbler orders opportunities whereby they may rise to be rivals of the so-called superior class.

A cultured and dutiful democracy is the basis of true imperialism. Such imperialism would never decay, decline, or degenerate like a small and restricted class. Fresh blood would always be infused in the ruling body to keep it in vigour, and the humblest member, knowing that his chance in life depended upon his capacity, would find the incentive to acquire the capacity by personal effort. The principal danger to avoid is the deification of material gain, which is undermining some modern democracies by setting up a privileged and uncultured plutocracy in place of the aristocracy of birth and breeding.

True imperialism, to be conducive to human happiness as well as to its own longevity, should not only be based on the home democracy but also take into partnership other races over whom its sway may extend. It should be one of its prominent aims to extend to backward races the light of knowledge and a sense of duty. That aim can be achieved by exercising power or influence over such races ; and, if that power is invariably and steadily used for the purpose of raising the condition of all classes and races under its sway, the power can never decline or intoxicate the possessor, or prove in any way injurious to those over whom it is exercised. It will also be the only means of extending to all mankind in the political sphere the brotherhood that culture secures in the moral sphere.

While there are no visible signs that any serious and sincere attempt is being made to constitute any race or class imperial, or to invest every member of a race with the power and prerogatives of Emperor, it is apparent that racial superiority at present consists in a race's possession of a larger number of men endowed with character, culture, discipline, and sense of duty. Such superiority will always enable a race to assert its mastery over races that do not possess at least an equal number of equally superior men. Idealism in government consists in affording the opportunity to, and in helping, every one in the community to possess the attributes of a ruler.

Every one cannot be an emperor or a ruler, but every one that is qualified to be a ruler must necessarily be a good and law-abiding citizen and subject ; and a community or a race in which every one is a dutiful subject and is capable, when called upon, of being an exemplary ruler, possesses the qualifications necessary to secure its own happiness and to advance the welfare of mankind.

There may be, and there is at the present day, a difference of opinion as to whether freedom or repression is the builder of character in individuals. Certain privileged classes in every community are for repression, not only because they wish their privileged position to remain secure, but also because they sincerely believe that a few are born for distinction and service, and that freedom leads to anarchy. Other classes are for freedom in order to break down the barriers that divide them from the privileged orders and deny them equal opportunities. Repression, privilege, and monopoly have the sanction of time and tradition on their side, and they can also plead that but for them the idea of freedom would not have come into existence. The great nations of the present day have attained their greatness not through freedom but through repression, which still prevails in some of the foremost States. If holders of power had always been mild despots, it is doubtful if any effort would ever have been made by the down-trodden masses to shake off the despotism.

“Hardness ever of hardness is mother.”

There is nothing more conducive to the development of character and of virility, nothing more purifying than ill-treatment at the hands of fellow-men that have been placed in favourable circumstances, forget their own “glassy essence,” and are deluded into a false security by ascribing to themselves infallibility and omnipotence. The struggle for mastery develops the finer qualities of the privileged individuals as well, since their opponents acknowledge their superiority

only when manly qualities are displayed by the oppressors. The absence of struggle causes degeneracy and decay to both sides.

Tyranny is inseparable from uncontrolled power in all ages and places, because the human mind does not possess the ballast necessary to keep its balance under all conditions. There are, and there have been, men and women who, although possessing absolute power, have not been tyrants, and they or their supporters claim credit for their gentleness; but the very fact of expecting praise for non-exercise of oppression proves the lurking tyrant within, and indicates the frailness of the reed on which mildness rests. When the mind comes to provide its own ballast, it ceases to be human and becomes divine. For the generality of minds, therefore, some form of control is necessary for ensuring the proper use of power as well as for the safety of those over whom it is exercised. In a healthy State, as in a sound physical system, each class or faculty discharges its functions on the principle of co-ordination of forces, and the requisite balance is preserved. If any force becomes unpatriotic or defective and unpractical, a deadlock ensues. To prevent the risk of deadlock and disaster, the forces must be under a supreme authority such as clever leadership or a cultured mind provides. When such leadership is absent, anarchy or disorder prevails; and, as in a hereditary system cleverness may not continue in the same family, the great thinkers and benefactors of mankind have introduced democracy, under which any person of any class may by merit attain prominence and power, and by which the people, who are most interested in good government, have the opportunity of selecting the persons they deem deserving of power. Democratic institutions, however, can succeed in leading mankind to bliss only if the people have the wisdom to place national affairs in the hands of men of character, conscience, sterling qualities, and determination to do what they believe

to be right whatever effect their action may have on their popularity. The danger of democracy is that persons without sound and strong principles may by rank, wealth, oratorical gifts, or other specious devices succeed in winning the confidence of the people and leading them astray, and that unless popularity is secured one's chance of usefulness in serving the State vanishes.

With the diffusion of the idea of personal liberty and of a larger voice of the people in the management of their affairs and in the control of their destinies, the old notions of law, order, and government are gradually disappearing. The hereditary holders of power are led by training as well as interest to lay stress on the importance and necessity of their authority in order to guard from danger, rank, wealth, and vested interests, but the more sensible among them are conscious of the futility of their claim. No change would have been necessary if authority had always had the faculty of observation, the culture, the foresight, and the patriotism to perceive that it exists not for its own sake, but for the benefit of the people that form the bulk of the community, and had guided its conduct and initiated reforms according to the needs of the time. Its want of intelligence and tact, its reliance on birth and heredity instead of qualification, and its hesitation to import fresh blood into its ranks and share with others the privilege of advancing national happiness, have caused the growth of the spirit of democracy, in which qualification and not birth is the passport of service to fellow-citizens. It is a matter of regret that with the advance of the democratic spirit and increase of impatience of interference, crimes of violence are becoming more frequent. With the development of freedom, the disposition to injure ought to grow less, and it is becoming incumbent on every citizen, in order to secure the full enjoyment of personal liberty, to be cognisant of one's duties to one's own self, to fellow-citizens, and to the State. Absolute freedom can

be enjoyed only when it is never directed towards selfish or unlawful ends, and when the security of a fellow-citizen is deemed to be of equal value to one's own security, as authority enjoys willing obedience when it is thoroughly just and impartial.

It should also be borne in mind that the responsibility of power changes to a certain extent the most confirmed democrat, because he finds in office that he has to deal with people and conditions of which he had an inadequate idea in the freedom of opposition. A democrat in power has to be firm, as a despot has to be gentle. Both are capable of advancing the interests of the community they rule if they listen to the counsel and criticism of all its sections. As an individual becomes perfect when all his mental, moral, intellectual, and physical faculties are fully developed by exercise and knowledge, a government becomes perfect when all classes and sections of the people are adequately represented in its counsels and receive due consideration. A legislature also becomes representative when all opinions and views are suitably represented in it by persons drawn from each class and section. A member of one class cannot possibly feel or know the wants and wishes of other classes with whom he never or seldom comes in contact. When a government and a legislature are thus constituted, no matter whether the head of the State is elected or hereditary, its prosperity is assured. Democracy or self-government can be real, enduring, and beneficial only when every member of the self-governed community is either capable or earnestly desirous of acquiring the capacity to govern himself: otherwise it is apt to degenerate, as it has done in some of the Colonies, into suspicion of the protecting State and defiance of its wishes and interests, and into an anxiety to be free from control of the Imperial Authority in order to get into the worst form of bondage devised by man for his own undoing—"the world's bond of slavery." Self-government is necessary and valuable when

any other form of government hinders and interferes with a free development of man's potentialities in all departments of life ; but, when it transfers the interests of man "from the frying pan into the fire," the stage of so-called freedom becomes no better than an oligarchic despotism. The difference is that in the latter case when the despots are conceited and selfish man undergoes slow torture, and in the other he commits suicide.

Independence, according to ancient ideas, was based on the capacity of a few individuals and families in a community to regulate national affairs, and its success always depended upon the ability and honesty of purpose of those that held power. According to modern notions, independence consists in the freedom to push and knock down with impunity everybody and everything that appears to displease, or that comes in the way of attainment of one's wishes. The modern idea of independence might be harmless if everybody had equal physical strength and moral bluntness to give back push for push and blow for blow, and to knock down the aggressor, in which case it would become a matter of the survival of the strongest muscles and the coarsest feelings. Under existing conditions "independence" places the most considerate, the most gentle, and the most humane at the mercy of their most aggressive and selfish neighbours.

Opinion is divided as to whether repression or concession, unkindness or indulgence, is the more potent for good. Some advocate the one, others the other, although both schools are perhaps equally anxious for human welfare. As a matter of fact, the potency of the one or of the other depends upon the mind on which it is exercised. Some are influenced by indulgence, others by unkindness. A general rule in this as in other matters concerning different types of mind does not hold good, but it may generally be admitted that the type of mind that wilfully or consciously injures others needs repression, and the other types deserve concession. As the

latter preponderate, unless human nature generally is taken to be wicked, concession appears to be the wiser policy, to be lavish or parsimonious as circumstances demand.

One type of mind magnifies difficulties, another type perceives the necessity of overcoming them. Difficulties, however great, shrink into comparative insignificance when human virility is brought to bear on them and faces them with courage. Capacity for government of self or of others does not consist merely in keeping order by fear or by repressive methods that were invented in barbarous ages and that even savages are adepts in practising ; nor does it consist in guarding the existing state of things from beneficial changes without which no individual or nation can advance in happiness. Statesmanship consists in observing the signs of the times, in advancing with the times, and in introducing reforms before they are extorted.

As individual life attains the ideal stage when all its faculties receive free play and full development, when passions are kept under control and prejudices are extinguished, and when it absorbs physically and morally the best ingredients of the food it receives, so national life advances with the sustaining influence of the sense of common danger and of common duties and responsibilities. The hindrance to ideal national life is the undutifulness of citizens, and such undutifulness often leads to crime. For the treatment of crime punishment has been provided, but it is a form of torture. For heinous crime capital punishment is more humane than prolonging the miserable existence of the offender in prison and affording him the opportunity of tainting others. Repression of tendencies due to uncontrolled passion and selfishness is essential, and punishment for offences deliberately committed against person or property has to be deterrent, but the State should not, like petty minds, be revengeful and vindictive, and torture in any shape should be abolished, however much a brutal criminal may deserve it. Crime is often the result of causes beyond

one's control, among which defective training or association is potent. According to specialists in mental disease, crime is also regulated by the weather, and is not so prevalent in summer as in winter. In fine and genial weather, people although in want have a tendency to be inactive (as residents in the tropics well know), and prefer lying lazily on the grass to working for a livelihood. Cold weather makes them energetic, fond of remaining indoors to drink, which results in deadening the senses and increasing the disposition to crime. Reformatory methods and training for criminals in imprisonment are evaded as being too costly for the State. If, however, each prisoner is put to such work as he is capable of doing, he may be made useful to the State, and the products of his workmanship, turned out under the guidance of competent teachers, may be a source of profit. Work in prison not only makes a prisoner useful while in restraint, but tends by discipline and knowledge to turn his thoughts away from crime and to make him an honest and respectable citizen when he regains his freedom. Prisoners that are incorrigible or violent, instead of being put in irons or solitary confinement (which might be tried for a reasonable time to see if they would alter their ways), may for the sake of clemency as well as of economy be executed. Keeping such creatures alive in fetters is torture for them, demoralising to their keepers, and needless expense to the State. Complete segregation with work and kind treatment or else execution—such should be the alternative for incorrigible felons. Any form of punishment that wounds self-respect, which is a necessity for human welfare, injures the interests of the State.

A State must possess a supreme head. The Sovereign, whether elected or hereditary, whether he holds supreme power for life or for a certain number of years, not only is the source of authority and the fountain of justice and mercy, but also as the moral and social leader of his people possesses the power of setting up a standard of manners and ideal

character. No country with absolute monarchical institutions can have real self-government or democracy, because monarchy needs a privileged class—a class standing between itself and the masses—to support it socially and politically ; and, so long as an irremovable authority or a privileged order exists, self-government is impossible. It is possible, as it is desirable for its own sake, that the privileged class should be popularised by the introduction of fresh recruits from other classes ; but these recruits, if they are to strengthen the order, should import not only popular sympathies but also firmness and fearlessness to resist uneducated popular pressure in times of national danger. If the privileged class is swayed, like the thoughtless mass, by momentary passion, prejudice, or self-interest, it ceases to deserve its privileged position. Hence for its own security, as well as for the strength of a monarchical State, the Sovereign should have the power—and should be ready to exercise the power—of taking away the honours and titles that the Crown has conferred, as he has to confer new titles and honours on deserving persons. By this means alone can a privileged order be made dutiful and stand as a bulwark against revolutions and popular passion and prejudice.

Among the more prominent States at the present time political self-government exists in France and in the United States, where the ruling authority may be changed any day by the action of the people. The state of affairs in both countries proves that they have got self-governing powers before being qualified to exercise them. The possession of self-government may give them a better opportunity than a class-government would do for developing their faculties and chance of happiness ; and it is on this account, as on account of the neglect of popular interests by a privileged class, that liberal-minded persons advocate popular governments. The possession of power before fitness may, however, be quite as injurious to the people and to the State as the government of an undutiful and selfish aristocracy. Democracies, before they have received

sufficient education, experience, and foresight, are much more likely than a sober and cultured class to be influenced by self-interest—limited to the satisfaction of temporary needs—by passing emotions and by passion. Governments relying on such democracies can never possess firmness enough to guard their honour, interests, and self-respect in dealing with foreign Powers or with acute vital problems at home.

Since the adoption of Republican institutions France has often shown such weakness. For the French people there may be no other alternative; but, if France is to remain a great Power and to wield among mankind the influence for good that was associated with her name in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, she should choose for rulers such men only as are above the domination or the need of popular favours. Masses, when they feel their power to be invincible, are more likely to bring about anarchy than titled and wealthy classes would be disposed to do. How official France, the product of democracy, is swayed by inconsistency and prejudice may be judged from the statement attributed to the French Ambassador in speaking of the new Government of Turkey: "The young Turks remain Orientals enamoured of strength; that is why they turn towards Germany and Austria." The young Turks may retort that Orientals are not alone in being enamoured of strength, and that it is quite as much the practice of Occidentals and their Governments to display similar tendencies and scant consideration for people that cannot make themselves dangerous by their strength. Turkey may now show a partiality for Germany and Austria, not because they are stronger than the Western Powers, but because their system of government makes their policy consistent and independent of the caprices of a fickle democracy.

As regards the United States, if it had remained true to the conception of the great founders of American independence, it would have gradually drawn within itself many countries which, in return for protection and freedom of development

afforded by the connection, would have been ready to discharge their duty to the entire State; but a turn has been given to its principles so that gold is now deemed more valuable than anything else, and a vigorous growth of virile faculties has been rendered difficult, if not impossible. Its democracy, gaining freedom before education, deems imperitance to be independence and lawlessness to be liberty, and, secure from invasion, it has displayed a tendency to lecture and threaten the rest of mankind. Not satisfied with taking the law into their own hands and lynching prisoners awaiting trial, its citizens have taken to shoot down judges when a friend is convicted of crime and punished—witness, the shooting of judge, sheriff, and other officials at Hillsville in Virginia in March, 1912. Its only chance of usefulness lies in a moral union with Great Britain, in which under the influence and sober example of British culture and statesmanship it may cast off the evil excrescences of premature independence, and march hand in hand with the British Empire to secure for mankind freedom, happiness, and peace. Otherwise, there will be the risk of its contaminating other States with its uncouth methods.

Some of the other offshoots and colonies of European States have similarly been granted self-government. Such grant is likely to prove beneficial or injurious according to the spirit that governs each community and its leaders. Hitherto they have imitated the ways of the United States more than those of the countries from which they sprang and to which they owe their security; and, instead of showing gratitude to the lands of their origin, to which they profess attachment (as necessary for freedom and avoidance of invasion and conquest), they freely reject reasonable proposals made by the Central Authority for the good of the whole. On the other hand, Germany, made great by efficient leadership as well as by the character of its people, is passing through a period of uncertainty owing to its peculiar position between a democratic

republic and an autocratic despotism. Militarism is an absolute necessity for its continued existence. Yet there are signs—such as the return of Socialists as the strongest homogeneous party in the Reichstag—that owing to the discontent with administrative methods the country is drifting towards revolution and popular institutions.

Although the results of premature self-government have so far not been successful in leading mankind to bliss, it would be risky to revert to the antiquated system of oligarchy or autocracy. Popular governments in which the holders of power are controlled by the people to a *certain* extent, without making rulers feel immunity from the results of selfishness or cramping their initiative in national concerns, or, on the other hand, letting the people get conceited by too much control over authority, form the best remedy for the evils that retard the orderly growth and development of the human faculties. The difficulty lies in the creation of an authority that can so regulate the relationship of the classes. When education spreads, and when a high sense of duty in which the interests of self are perceived to be identical with those of neighbours governs human conduct, the classes will themselves be able to regulate the relationship. Till then it will have to drift as best it can through passing joys and triumphs at one time, and sorrows and trials at another, emerging ultimately into the condition that will lead man to bliss.

So long as the best, the wisest, and the least selfish members of a community hold power and guide its destinies, it matters little whether the country is governed by despotism or democracy. Such rulers can or will never do anything to injure the interests of the people. The risks in despotism are that the holders of power unless removable become wilful and infallible, wish to restrict power to a small circle, which may not always contain or produce gifted minds, and to set up a privileged class. Democracy avoids these risks, and under it the best available men may always be expected to guide

public affairs. If, however, these should be reluctant to undertake public duty or not be of the best type, democracy relapses into despotism or disorder. As a despot cannot be changed, despotism has invariably deteriorated capacity in the ruling family and brought about revolution. Democracies have caused disorder only when authority has proved lax, or when, like the proverbial beggar on horseback, incompetent men without balance of judgment have got intoxicated by unexpected power. When despots deem themselves saviours of order and society, they cannot help getting conceited and heartless, while the victim comes to regard officers of the law not as friends and guardians but as enemies of the people.

Law ought to be sacred, and ought to be obeyed; but, when it is framed by despots for personal ends without consulting the best minds amongst the people that are affected by it or by overriding their expressed wishes, no reasonable person would hold that such a law deserves respect or obedience: and, if it does not deserve respect, the inevitable consequence is contempt for it, with attempts to evade it, and with loss of respect for its maker. When laws restraining freedom are concocted, it should be borne in mind that they affect the law-abiding much more than the wicked. For example, a law of disarmament would prevent peaceful citizens from keeping arms to protect themselves, but would not affect the clandestine possession of arms by the robber or the burglar. There is less chance of wrong-doing when all are equally free and control each other than when it is checked by fear of authority that does not command respect.

For purposes of national progress and unification, rulers and warriors devised the notion of invasion and conquest. The ancient plan was for every ruler on coming to the throne to invade a neighbour's territory in order to prove his prowess to his subjects as well as to neighbours, to provide a diverting occupation for his people, and also, when feasible, to annex weaker States. The modern plan is to enter a country as

peaceful traders and suppliants for favour, then to lend money to the ruler, next to create panics so as to secure help against the tyrannical ruler, thereupon to instigate internal revolt and treachery, and lastly to support the ruler by military power, such support developing into a permanent occupation owing to risks of withdrawal. Even after conquest and annexation, panics become necessary at times to ensure the continuance of foreign domination, and to proclaim in the language of Louis XV. of France "*Après moi, le déluge.*" Except under the influence of culture, excuse has never been, nor will be, wanting for the perpetration of wrong when the victim is in the clutches of the wrong-doer.

One of the worst consequences of despotism or domination of a class or of a race is that, the moment it secures itself firmly in power, patriotism becomes a crime, and the subject people are demoralised, while the dominant force degenerates by conceit and regards anything done by the subjects to improve their condition as rebellion, revolution, and wickedness. Statesmen that are peacefully disposed lament that nations do not follow the example of individuals and regard an appeal to law instead of an appeal to force as the natural course for settling disputes. They seem to ignore that individuals are forced to settle disputes peacefully by a superior power—the strength of the State. No power is yet in existence to stop forceful strife among nations, or to settle peacefully differences between a people and their rulers.

The happiness and security of States and nations, as of individuals, depend a great deal upon solvency—the capacity to secure the means by which happiness may be advanced. Wealth, like poverty, has its drawbacks and risks, but a man or a nation suffering from chronic hunger and want of means to provide the necessities of physical existence can scarcely have the inclination or the time to think of improving the moral condition. If one retire into futile isolation, it is practicable for him, by culture, contentment, and self-control,

to reduce his wants to a point inconceivable to worldly minds; but it is not possible to be in the midst of the struggle of life and yet to suppress all physical wants. Means being needed, the question arises as to how to secure them. One way of being above want is to possess financial resources that can generally command all that is necessary to advance happiness. Wealth, however, generates or excites desire for luxury, and encourages lassitude and selfishness. In order to acquire it, individuals resort to questionable devices, or neglect more important considerations. It will generally be found that individuals may easily place themselves above want by labour and thrift, and by abstention from useless and injurious luxuries. For a State prosperity depending on solvency is easy to secure when the nation as a whole is morally and physically fit for work and wishes only for legitimate gain, and when every member of the community is ready to contribute what he can spare for the national treasury. In national as in individual development, love of labour and thrift will be found to be at the root of independence and self-respect. Until, however, such ideal conditions come into being, the welfare of a State depends upon taxation, which has to be so regulated as not to press unduly upon any individual, class, or industry. With selfishness rampant, every person or class, while professing great concern for the well-being of the nation, wishes the burden of taxation to fall upon others, and deems it a grievance when taxation is increased. It is therefore not an easy matter for rulers to impose taxation and find resources for national advancement without displeasing somebody or some class. Individual prosperity depends upon willingness to work for an honest livelihood and upon the indisposition to spend on anything that is not absolutely necessary for life. National prosperity depends upon economy, or avoidance of extravagance and wastefulness, as well as upon just taxation. Economy depends upon wisdom, upon the capacity to discern between necessary and useless

expenditure, and upon the care of the authority in charge of the national purse to regard disbursement of the smallest sum with as much concern as a prudent and thrifty individual regards his own private expenses. Like thriftless individuals, wasteful rulers squander national resources on useless projects that neither secure the safety of the nation against invasion nor advance its happiness. Improvident rulers hinder the prosperity of a State as much as undutiful or careless custodians of the purse of private individuals. In national as well as individual well-being, however, when the resources are large enough not to interfere with desirable projects, some wastefulness, although undesirable from the point of view of thrift, does not matter so much as in cases where any difficulty is experienced in making the ends meet.

Fair and legitimate taxation depends upon the observance of three important principles. First, that it should not cripple individual or national effort towards advancement in any desirable sphere of life ; secondly, that its burden should fall according to capacity to bear it without inconvenience or without depriving any citizen of the absolute necessities of life ; and thirdly, that only luxuries should be subject to taxation. A graduated income tax appears to be an ideal means of raising revenue if the graduation reaches every individual in the community that has a residence in the country and is able to contribute to the national exchequer a percentage of what he spends on himself and family. Exemption from taxation of anybody that claims to have a voice in national affairs is not desirable. Wisdom lies in making the burden as light as individual circumstances and national needs permit, and in avoidance of inquisitorial methods. The principle is generally admitted that the amount spent on absolute necessities of life—such as house rent, food, clothes, education, fire and light, and medical charges—should be exempt from taxation ; but no standard of life is set up as determining what is a necessity and what is a luxury in the life of a citizen. An individual that

can spend on those items can certainly afford to support the State that enables him to earn his livelihood in peace and safety. Every citizen, however small his income, should therefore pay the tax after deduction of what for one in his position in life is absolute necessity. If small incomes are exempted from taxation, the only way to make every citizen contribute to the State is by indirect methods, which mean taxation of food and clothes. Similar deduction should be made from the largest income, the allowance varying according to what is held to be absolute necessity for the holder of the income. The right principle is that every income should be taxable, and that absolute necessities of life on a reasonable scale should be exempted. The tax may be rightly levied on savings, but even then, when the savings are invested and the tax is levied on the yield of the investments it becomes a compound tax, like unpaid interest added to principal. In addition to income tax, luxuries—such as clothes beyond what is absolutely necessary, conveyances, servants, liquor, and tobacco—may legitimately be subjected to high taxation. Any balance possibly required might be made up by imposing death duties on a scale admitting the State, which has enabled the acquisition of fortune, into the category of “next of kin.” The conclusion can, however, be generally drawn that it is not high taxation, or large income, that makes a State or an individual prosperous, but the avoidance of extravagance and of thriftlessness.

It is customary to speak of the desirability of fair taxation as of fair play, but few agree as to where fairness lies. A thief or a burglar deems it fair play to steal or to rob when he is in want, and a murderer to kill another against whom he may have a grudge. Fair play means one's own play, unless a stronger power lays down what is fair. If everybody wishes others than oneself to be taxed, fair taxation becomes an impossibility. Hence ministers and rulers after holding office for a time always incur unpopularity : they find it a hopeless task

to please everybody, or even a majority. The State of which they are custodians has, however, to live and thrive, and it thrives best when rulers do not think of popularity so much as of discharging their duty according to their lights. So long as favours to individuals or to classes are avoided, it will be found that measures come to be fair ; and it should also be borne in mind that unfairness does not become fair because its perpetrators are strong enough to commit it or because its victims are few in number.

The problem of individual poverty, which exists in every country whether under a Free Trade or under a Protectionist policy, is the most complicated of social questions. The contrast between poverty and wealth is bound to be more acute as a country becomes richer. Wealth may be more widely distributed by artificial means, and the growth of commerce and trade, which depends upon superiority in quality and cheapness of the products, may make a larger number of people better off or even extremely rich ; but the growth of wealth inevitably brings in its train greater leisure, more luxuries, and increased disposition for frivolities and pleasures, which make the toilers less disposed to work and further aggravate their wants. The problem will not be solved by heavily taxing the rich or by confiscating their property to enable the poor to live comfortably and to multiply freely. The problem of poverty can be solved only by a regulation of the supply of labour, by education tending to make the labourer more dutiful, less lazy, and less disposed to improvident marriage, and by setting up an authority to settle disputes between capital and labour, and so to arrange matters that the labourer may have a reasonable living wage without depriving the capitalist of a reasonable return on his outlay. The profits of every industry should also be equitably divided between labour and capital. The truth cannot be too often or too strongly impressed that labour in different forms is the road to competence, freedom, happiness, and knowledge, and that everything that tends to encourage laziness is demoralising.

Next in importance to solvency is the question of defence against aggression, insult, and invasion. Individuals have to provide against the evils of physical ailments, mental disorder, and outside enemies. Sound health is easy enough to secure by regulation of diet, exercise, and sleep, by observance or cleanliness, and by the avoidance of enervating influences. In the regulation of diet, exercise, and sleep, a uniform rule cannot be laid down for all individuals : differences of idiosyncracies, habits, and sentiments necessitate different treatment. It will generally be found by careful observation, however, that avoidance of food or drink that disagrees and moderate use of what is agreeable and nourishing are the easiest means of escaping illness and of obviating medical treatment. Similar care has to be observed in exercise and rest. Too much attention to muscular development impairs the faculties of the brain. Training for diet, exercise, and rest, should commence early in life in order that the appetites may not by habit become stronger than reason. Side by side with physical development, the culture of the mind must similarly be studied, in order to make both effective.

In individual life the law that regulates moral and physical existence is so strict that any violation entails punishment in the shape of suffering ; in national life the social as well as the political machine is so delicately adjusted that a change in speed of a minute wheel may affect the entire machine for good or ill. The consequence of such violation or change may not be immediately felt, and it may not be easy to detect the particular occasion when the violation takes place, or to spot the individual that becomes the instrument of change. Nevertheless the responsibility ought to be felt by every individual, unless the action of fate is admitted and one acknowledges oneself its unconscious victim.

In human affairs, whether individual or national, there is seldom a choice between positive good and absolute evil. The choice is generally relative—between greater and less evil, or

between some and no good. In the choice one is often perplexed through anxiety to secure more than what is available ; but when the choice proves mistaken the mistake must be attributed to some force beyond human control—to fate. It is to be recognised, however, that fate works, not through helplessness or lethargy, but through human virility, and when in spite of the best effort the desired good is not secured the decree of fate may for the time be admitted to be triumphant. It may still be changed by continued effort unless the game is given up in despair. Fatalism may be of two kinds—vacuous and virile. In vacuous fatalism the faculties with which man is endowed are not exercised and everything is believed to happen as ordained by nature or by some unseen force beyond human control. This kind of fatalism leads to lethargy and decay. Virile fatalism is a source of happiness through avoidance of worry. It leads one to perceive that every faculty is given to be exercised justly and according to circumstances, and that, while every effort must be made to discharge the duty in hand, success or failure is beyond human control. Anxiety in the discharge of duty generates nervousness, which interferes with bold conception and paralyses performance.

To be able to secure anything desirable in life—such as culture, happiness, health, usefulness, virility—the first need is a happy home. In the absence of a happy home, or of any home, it is indeed possible to secure some of these advantages otherwise under favourable conditions, especially if one sets one's mind to acquire the desired object ; but for the generality of mankind happiness at home is an indispensable condition. Home is the source of happiness, of patriotism, of humanitarianism, and of religiousness. One that is not happy cannot be a sincere patriot ; one that is not a patriot cannot be humanitarian ; one that is not humanitarian cannot be religious. There may be fits of these great and virtuous sentiments because the germs exist in every mind, or there

may be a semblance or pretence of possessing the virtue ; but, to make it dominant in the mind, early teaching is necessary.

Training of the mind commences when the baby in arms, although unable to speak or express its ideas and wishes, begins to be wide awake to all that passes around. Heredity influences life from the first stage ; and good or evil tendencies, success or failure, develop according to a child's endowment and environment. Governments and States have undertaken the task of repelling invasion, of suppressing crime, of providing some education, sanitation, and unadulterated food, but they have done little to fulfil the equally important duty of providing suitable moral teaching and guardianship for a child not endowed with dutiful and cultured parentage and environment. Such a procedure may, according to current notions, be an encroachment on the "sacredness" of family life ; but, unless the sacredness of family life means license to continue evil among mankind, it will be generally admitted that the State has as much right and interest to watch over the moral as well as the physical development of its citizens as to impose taxation, to enact laws, and to provide defensive armaments.

Every duty necessary for the growth and happiness of citizens would be discharged by a State if it could secure servants that would be as paternal to their fellow-citizens as cultured parents are to their own children. Because officialism or bureaucracy is rigid, without gentleness or consideration for those whose interests are placed in its hands, it has come to be regarded as a necessary evil. The difference in the conduct of officials under popular control and under despotism proves that it is not difficult to make arrangements whereby officials would be paternal guardians and not unsympathetic despots.

In the education of children a few cardinal points ought to be observed. A child should have perfect freedom of development, moral and physical, without interference except when it is in danger. Even then, the interference ought to be exer-

cised in such a way as to guard the child from evil without letting it know that it is guarded. Consciousness of being looked after diminishes self-reliance. A hard or stern formalist or taskmaster does more harm to the infant mind by coercion and unkind treatment than the best intellectual training can do good. A child should never be spoken to harshly or scolded. Even when it does anything wrong, probably enough from ignorance or thoughtlessness, the child should be told pleasantly that the act was wrong and ought to be avoided. Anything that cramps a child's spirits and courage or affects the nerves not only makes it miserable for the time but injures its future life. Good training consists in developing the spirit of self-help, in commanding obedience with love and sympathy, in avoiding hurry in lessons, and generally in doing nothing that paralyses the understanding. A dutiful parent's or guardian's business is to save the child from physical and moral infection, and to provide for its mental and muscular development according to its age, capacity, and natural tendency. Any attempt to secure obedience by inspiring fear affects the nerves and prevents the child's proper growth. A child can never consciously do any wrong unless it is misled by teaching or by example.

The ultimate aim of education should be the formation and development of character, as well as the acquisition of necessary knowledge. Both depend upon the teacher—upon his character and acquirements, and upon the methods he adopts to induce his pupil to love knowledge where such love does not exist, to shake off timidity when nature is timid and shy, and to cultivate a repugnance to wrong-doing and evil-thinking. The branches of the tree of knowledge are innumerable, while new discoveries and inventions are constantly increasing the number. It is impossible in the span of human life, with its reckless waste of time and energy in unnecessary frivolities and injurious pursuits, to gain even a smattering of many of the branches; but it ought to be recognised that no man or

woman can be fully developed without securing adequate command of the main branches of knowledge. Good education consists in laying the foundations upon which a solid structure may be built by the pupil as he or she advances in life. Intellectual education to fit boys and girls for the desk and the office is necessary, but their attention should also be directed to the applied arts and sciences, to handicrafts, and to the fine arts. Manual instruction and nature study are eminently suitable for the development of natural capacity, character, and independence.

Like children, the backward and depressed classes of a community need more care and attention than the classes that are better off. To advance their moral and physical welfare, two things are indispensable: human instruments and financial resources. When regular instructors and advisers are not available, advancement by teaching or example becomes difficult. They may sometimes be secured from abroad, but the risk of introducing a foreign element is great. If selfishness or patriotism surmount humanity and sense of duty, the foreign instruments cannot advance the interests of the country or people they serve. Unless, therefore, native talent is available, the only way to secure the necessary instruments is to send young men abroad to bring home the knowledge, experience, and culture of more advanced communities. The financial resources have to be provided either according to the modern plan of taxation of the community, or, according to the old system, by wealthy residents of a locality, whose interests as well as pleasure should be served in advancing the welfare of neighbours and making them zealous supporters in time of need.

Wealth or economic freedom is only the means to enable people to devote themselves to moral and intellectual pursuits. By some it is regarded as the end of life; by others as the root of many evils. There is a middle view, which may be deemed more reasonable. Money or any other material pos-

session, when acquired honestly, used rightly, and enjoyed sensibly, can never be a source of evil. Things are often beneficial or mischievous according to the view the mind may take, and to the use made of them. Hence such things are not intrinsically good or bad, but may be considered unreal and unreliable and therefore unworthy of notice. A perception of the mixture of good and evil in most things should lead to the conclusion not to discard them, but to take the good part out of them. Freedom from want and from being a victim of the appetites is necessary for development of character and culture. Such freedom is secured either by control of the appetites or by their legitimate satisfaction. There is as little chance of one in a chronic state of hunger or thirst being able to do great deeds as of one rolling in wealth and luxury. In the former case the needs of material existence, and in the latter environments and defective training, bar the way. Comparative poverty has produced the greatest geniuses among mankind ; wealth or social distinction has generally smothered genius when found in its ranks. Both luxury and necessity have thus to be avoided, and that statesmanship is great and that wisdom is true which can secure for every member of the community equal opportunities for the display or growth of genius by preventing the accumulation of too great wealth and by extinguishing poverty. It is possible to make wealth, title, power, and rank instruments of good if the head of the possessor is not turned by flattery or servility. Geniuses and intellectual giants by achieving fame and fortune prove to mankind how by coolness and serenity, unmoved by passing events and trials, strength may be utilised for the benefit of fellow-men without injuring its possessor. When power or wealth is so used, the greater it grows the more beneficial it is for man ; when abused, it retards human progress as well as slays the possessor, perhaps sweetly for a time, like frivolous pleasures, but all the more surely in the end beyond possibility of recovery.

Provision against outside enemies amongst compatriots

and neighbours is made by the State in the shape of the Judiciary and the Police. Ordinary personal precautions have to be taken to avoid being duped or ill-treated by unscrupulous neighbours. One way of avoiding them is to live in seclusion and have no dealings with strangers, who, with the increasing competition and harder struggle, are ever ready to take advantage of a good-natured customer. Seclusion, however, is not possible in a life intended for struggle, at least in youth and manhood, and the best way to guard oneself from assaults in any shape is to develop from childhood moral courage and physical strength. Contentment is another phase of a good training. To do one's best as circumstances permit and to be contented with the amount of success achieved is the ideal state of individual existence. Chronic discontent or grumbling is a proof of helpless selfishness, and leads to mendicancy, oppression, or plunder. It will generally be found that a prudent and watchful person endowed with contentment and nerve manages to avoid the ills of life and enjoys the greatest amount of happiness.

National life being composed of individual existence, its welfare rests upon the number of members of the corporate body that have the wisdom to subordinate personal ends to the general weal. The fundamental difference between individual and national security lies in the fact that, while in well-organised communities an individual, however great or prominent, weak or obscure, is safe from harm under the shield of justice, national safety can be assured by the nation itself and by no external force. An individual has to exercise his faculties if he desires to secure what is valued by mankind, but, having secured it, or not caring for it, he may live in peace without fear of injury. A nation, through its guardians, must always be on the alert to guard its very existence from assault. The more cultured, gifted, and prominent an individual becomes, the more respect he secures from the community. The more prominent and powerful a nation becomes,

the more jealousy it arouses among other nations. An individual, by attaining position and commanding respect, is enabled to benefit the community in various ways. A nation when strong and feared does not think of doing good to other nations, but of despoiling them. This is so because there has not as yet come into being any force that can prevent one nation from insulting or attacking another for the sake simply of the aggressor's aggrandisement or profit. The predatory instincts of the human mind, based on undisciplined selfishness of bygone ages, are only too obvious in national dealings, and they also lead individuals to imitate the wickedness.

No amount of moral culture or of intellectual superiority can guard a nation from invasion and conquest if it lacks the physical strength to resist assaults and to give two blows for one. It generally happens that in the act of self-defence a nation finds itself stronger than the aggressor; the tables are turned, and the defenders are compelled to be despoilers. So long as nations remain selfish and addicted to plunder and robbery at a suitable opportunity, and so long as national security depends upon alliances, which are sought only if the allies are strong enough to render help in case of need, it is the first duty of every nation to keep itself strong for defence, and also for offence when necessary.

In modern life defensive and offensive strength can be secured in two ways: either by a sense of duty inducing every able-bodied citizen to offer himself for military or naval training and to join the colours whenever there is national danger, or else by compulsory service. However brave, patriotic, and self-sacrificing individuals may be, they cannot in modern warfare do much to defend their homes unless they have gone through the requisite training. Military efficiency is attainable by knowledge of the arts of war, and of the conditions against and under which it has to be waged. An efficient army is needed for two purposes: first, to keep

order within, and secondly, to repel foreign invasion. In modern civilised States, where freedom ought to make every citizen law-abiding and culture makes every ruler dutiful, no army is needed for internal order, but, until a general disarmament is arranged among the more powerful States, invasions are always possible and have to be guarded against. Recent wars have proved that, in addition to effective instruments of slaughter, an overwhelming superiority in numbers is needed to secure victory. The great defensive problem of the day in every State is how to form that army, to equip it for war, to mobilise it quickly when the need arises, and to be prepared to deal the first blow with decisive effect. For an army to deserve victory, it should, in addition to discipline and training, possess in the ranks education, intelligence, and, above all, devotion to leaders, and in the commanders capacity to handle enormous masses of men. To secure masses of trained men, it has become necessary for States with an extended land frontier to introduce universal military service by persuasion or compulsion. It is eminently a defensive measure, and when citizens are mindful of their duties no coercion is required to raise the necessary number of recruits. When, however, people are wanting in patriotism and sense of duty, or show a tendency to do nothing until danger actually threatens, conscription or some other form of compulsion becomes necessary.

Whether formed by persuasion or by compulsion, armaments are desirable also to keep awake and alert the defensive and fighting propensities of man. With increasing professions of friendship among nations, the armaments have a tendency to grow, as with the advance of democracy serious crime appears to increase and the police force has to be strengthened. Conscripts or citizen-soldiers cannot, however, be expected to carry on a war of aggression or invasion. Hence it is a security against distant adventures to rely upon a citizen army. Such troops may agree to go and remain abroad for a time,

but they become home-sick as soon as they get tired of the change of scenery and surroundings. States that need a large and efficient force for distant or foreign service have to depend upon mercenaries, who can be called upon to proceed anywhere. It is evident that if educated citizens can be induced to serve their State in distant parts, they would morally render the State much greater service than ill-educated mercenaries, as they would never oppress the people of the country. Where compulsory service prevails to a large extent the professional soldier will tend to disappear, and foreign conquests will have to be given up. This may be desirable for States that have to guard against invasion by powerful neighbours, but for insular States possessing distant territories and a strong navy a professional army fully equipped and trained is sufficient for security. They have not to undergo the inconveniences inseparable from compulsion, the disastrous effect upon the labour market, the disinclination to be dragooned, and the introduction of the evils of militarism.

It would be a good thing if those persons that are spoilt by comfort, luxuries, and wealth could be compulsorily enlisted into the army, as, in the absence of occupation, they are apt to become nomadic, to have no fixed home, to live in hotels, motors, steamers, and trains, to rush to places where the most enjoyment can be had, and, when they have anything to do, not to do it well, being anxious to run away for week-ends or a holiday. For their own good, and for the good of the community, which has enabled them to command leisure and independence, they cannot do better than devote a part of their youth to military training and discipline. Enabled to lead a lazy and selfish existence in times of peace, they may justify their possessions by preparing for and rendering service to their country at a critical time. Compulsory military service, in spite of some serious drawbacks, is, *if kept under civil control*, less open to objection than a separate and powerful military party, which may at times get out of control and

subvert its creator. There is no *royal* road to acquisition or retention of empire over fellow-men. If any State wishes to be "imperial," or even to guard its existence from discontent within and from assaults without, the only way is either to possess invincible brute force—superior to any possible combination of adverse forces—or to have liberal and just administration, so that in need every citizen may willingly and joyfully gather round the national standard and be ready to conquer or to die.

In national life it is by tradition the custom of a strong nation to deal with a weaker nation as if the latter were a vassal, and to adopt a different attitude towards an equal or stronger Power. This attitude or policy in conventional language is called diplomacy, and in individual intercourse is hypocrisy and double-dealing. If it is not possible for individuals or nations to come in contact with each other without recourse to oppression or sycophancy or undue familiarity, the hope of leading mankind to bliss may be abandoned. The bearing and conduct of cultured and honourable individuals, however, happily prove that, when material interests are not the predominant consideration, it is easy not only for individuals but also for nations to be honest and honourable. Honesty consists in saying and doing things exactly as one wishes their effect to be, without attempting to conceal the intention either by flattery or by menace. Every one that has tried to be honest without being rude knows that it is possible to associate with people without loss of self-respect on one side or the other. Until all individuals, or at any rate the vast majority, attain that stage of culture, one may sometimes come across "tiresome persons" or feel disappointment; but to cope with and to extinguish the inveterate evil must be a slow process. Christianity does not appear to have done much in nearly two thousand years, any more than other religious or moral teaching, and the reason is that honesty succumbs to material considerations, the result of the conflict laying bare the weakness of the teaching.

As regards honour, which is merely a strict sense of justice and right, its code may easily be observed by everybody if only the training is given early in life—if the lesson is inculcated that, while it is possible to gain an advantage by unjust means, it is equally easy to be hoodwinked by another; that, while it is possible to guard oneself against injury by others, it is not so easy to avoid loss and suffering from one's own stupidity or want of care, and that in the long run peace and happiness lie in the possession of an easy conscience and not of fickle material gain. Honest and honourable life, whether for individuals or for nations, ought to be commenced in the infancy of every individual person. Proper environment in infancy and happiness at the fireside are indispensable both for leading an honest life and for fighting evil in the world successfully. If one is so unfortunate as not to obtain these advantages, one has little chance of being useful to mankind or of securing happiness for one's own self.

Next to one's duty to one's family, one's duty to the public, to associates, and to neighbours is sacred and urgent, and has to be learnt and discharged. Example often does as much good or harm as precept. It is pitiable to see how some people behave in public, in the streets, parks, and railway trains. The education of public opinion in relation to public morals is imperative, if the happiness of mankind is to be advanced. This may be done by early teaching and prevention of evil example, and by authoritative stoppage of public display of immoral and undutiful conduct and suggestions.

With security against attack, assault, insult, and invasion, individual and national energies may be directed to the attainment of the objects, material and moral, that contribute to the advancement of human happiness. The very fact that some individuals and some races are happier and more advanced than others is evidence that it is possible for the backward individuals and races to come up to the standard of their happier brethren. It is likely to happen that, while they attempt to

catch up the others, the latter will advance as well, and that thus the relative positions will be maintained. Advancement being relative, one may be content to observe the progress made, without hindering the further advance of the go-ahead brethren. It is absolutely essential for advancement in every sphere of life that there should be a few to stand out as beacons for their fellow-men. A dead level of uniformity in moral or material qualifications cannot be conducive to emulation and progress.

Some persons are so vain as to claim all virile attributes on the ground of birth in a particular locality or family. They deserve credit if they can retain virile qualities in spite of unfavourable conditions, or can acquire them by their personal efforts. But if they possess wisdom as well as virility, they will readily admit that such qualities are not the monopoly of any age, race, class, creed, family, or individual. Mankind would have little chance of advancement if virility became a monopoly. The physical conditions of birth and growth, when parents are healthy and above want, are much alike for all individuals. The moral environments after birth exert a most powerful influence in making them good, bad, or indifferent, useful or useless, happy or miserable, honest or criminal. The germs of virility exist in every mind, as muscles exist in every physical frame, to be developed or to degenerate according to favourable or unfavourable circumstances.

In face of the development of a spirit of democracy without corresponding culture or sense of duty, modern Governments are placed on the horns of a dilemma. Under present conditions it is no easy matter to reconcile the imperative necessity of preserving order with the duty of securing fair play for all sections of a community. Trade Unions have been permitted to grow until they threaten to impose on society their tyranny in place of that of the old oligarchy. Unions for legitimate ends are permissible and desirable ; but,

when they cause strikes and take to violence, they produce misery and privation to the working classes themselves as well as to innocent people. Governments ought to occupy a position of impartiality and to enjoy the confidence of both capital and labour, of tradespeople and customers, of producers and consumers. They should also induce capital to be reasonable and fair in time so as not to be forced to make concessions. There must be an official authority to settle disputes between large classes of the community, as there are for individual differences. The Judiciary will doubtless enforce the law in case of disorder, but penalties cannot be justified unless accompanied by provisions for compulsory arbitration between masters and men. The same principle applies to rulers and ruled, where the ruled have no voice in the appointment and selection of rulers, but in this case international laws and courts should be set up to arbitrate. If such arbitration cannot be instituted, there is no other means of settling disputes between classes or between rulers and peoples than civil war or the military intervention of a foreign Power.

In a well-ordered system of government by democracy, the majority (even of one) rule, and the minority influence the rulers by criticism and watchfulness. In States divided into progressives and conservatives, when progressives are in power the conservatives restrain them from too quick progress, and when conservatives govern the progressives keep them from lethargy or reaction. In a despotism, restraint is exercised by benevolence and sense of responsibility; and, when these do not exist, riots and revolution provide the remedy for wrong, and, if unsuccessful in influencing the despots, pave the way for foreign invasion. Reactionaries taunt the democracy with choosing guides that are not "born to rule," and that have not had opportunities of studying deeply the art of government. Their anxiety for the greatness and prosperity of the nation is naturally bounded by their anxiety to secure for birth and blood a monopoly of service to the State. They profess con-

cern for a "real aristocracy"—the aristocracy of brains, of patient study, and of balanced appreciation of facts. If they are sincere in their profession, they ought to be happy in the thought that in no democracy has any one without brains been able to command influence, and that democracies, like aristocracies of birth, have degenerated only when they have ceased to produce men of brains, culture, and high principles. Special rights or privileges for one class mean, not only corresponding disabilities on other classes, but the encouragement of conceit in the privileged class. A benefactor would avoid advocating or doing anything that develops conceit. Decay, individual and national, commences with the abnormal development of conceit. Aryan sages advised people to flatter and encourage complacency in those that they wished to destroy. Right teaching consists in imparting a consciousness of one's insignificance in the great order of creation, and the right way of life is to feel insignificance even when circumstances enable one to render laudable service. In avoiding conceit care should be taken not to develop a sense of helplessness, which might obstruct the exercise of virile faculties with which one is endowed.

Man's resolutions, like his health, are subject to external conditions and change with those conditions. Some are proud of a strong will, but even where the will is strong the claim is one of degree, and liable to degenerate into obstinacy, or to change under adverse conditions. To be proud of possessions or of endowments without inquiring how they came may gratify self-assertion, but when undeserved the pride excites ridicule or tempts imitation, and when deserved no trumpeting is needed. The far-sighted are aware that every worldly object is liable to change, and that virility displays itself in putting off adverse change and in hastening change that is beneficial. Evil cannot be exterminated from a life that is always being dragged under its influence to decay and death; but, by making it remote or by keeping it in check, the free

play of virtue and virility is achieved. Crime, destitution, and physical degeneracy are the fruits of undesirable social environment traceable to monopoly, pride, and vanity. They are amenable to treatment on the lines of a recognition of duties attaching to industrial enterprise and to private property as to position, rank, and power. It is a reasonable contention that what one produces by one's brain, muscle, or skill, should be one's own private property ; but it is not an unreasonable view that the circumstances that have helped in the production should have due weight, and should entitle to a fair share those that have in any way helped in the process. Antiquated traditions have to be removed before solid foundations can be laid for useful and virile institutions. Care has only to be taken that progressive enthusiasm does not lapse into violence or display the monopolist want of consideration.

In this imperfect creation there is often a choice of evils or of relative dislikes. Nothing can be built up unless old things are destroyed, and yet to destroy anything without adequate conception of what is to come in its place is a risky process, which may not be conducive to good. There are things that can be built on old foundations ; and there are things that cannot rest on decayed bases. As in architecture, cleverness is tested by prevision, but there are not a few experts whose prevision proves ultimately to be wrong. Individuals and nations prove their usefulness, not by what they pull down, but by what they construct ; and the safest course in building up is to avoid superficial generalisation, to secure effective co-operation, to avoid a tendency to dogmatism or despotism, and to keep an eye always not so much on the finite self which perishes, but on the universal self without end.

In human history orderly development depends upon the recognition of the right moment for change, for construction, for destruction, and for the exercise of influence and power. Like drugs that are efficacious in illness when rightly administered, all measures, from the training of a child to concession

of popular demands, when taken in time and in right quality and quantity, contribute to progress and happiness. Opinions differ as to the right moment or the requisite quality and quantity, but it will be generally found that whatever is done without selfish motives proves to be for the best. The welfare of individuals, as of States, rests upon the regulation of various forces which, when so organised as to act together without discord, advance strength and unity. In individuals, self is the material portion having beginning, variegated fortune, and end, not the spiritual part, which is the same in all. The material part of a nation is composed of divergent classes and elements that may never come together or physically intermix, but its vitality is in the spiritual union that embraces all classes, races, and ranks of which the nation is composed. An individual thrives in proportion to the impetus given to the virile and virtuous tendencies and to the repression of evil instincts and training. A State prospers in proportion to the increase or desirable citizens and to the decrease of the degenerate and undesirable. The degenerate portion is not confined to any particular class, rich or poor—though naturally the poor have the larger numbers. Increase of wealth and desire for luxury tend to the growth of the undesirable among the rich, and desire to shirk labour has the same effect among the poor. Whether among rich or poor, labour is the means for the attainment of knowledge, independence, and happiness. The abuse or disuse of brain and muscle leads an individual and a State to decay and ruin, while their restriction within a limited circle retards development and causes their extinction.

Anything that is deemed desirable for individuals for the advancement of peace, happiness, or security—such as cleverness, goodness, honesty, knowledge, freedom, power, or wealth—is in the first place naturally sought for one's own self, and secondly for children or those that are next favourites. The aim to extend its benefits to all with whom one comes in contact, and ultimately to mankind, must be present to prevent

its developing selfishness or jealousy. For the same reason, one should not attempt or desire to confine or to propagate evil among strangers or enemies under the delusion that one will not be affected by it. Though individuals may not live long enough to suffer for the consequences of their acts, yet in the eternal life of the world heirs, successors, or blood relations, whose interests are only next in importance to one's own, have to pay the penalty. Individuals exist, and have existed in every age and race in large or in restricted numbers according to its culture, that have acted up to the great principle; but no nation that has attained greatness or prominence has yet tried to give effect to it, whether because the best and most conscientious men in a nation seldom come to power or continue long in power, or because an idea prevails that "practical" life means life as one finds it with its defects and limitations, and not, as one should try to make it, without such defects and limitations.

Proper education consists, not in the acquisition of mental subtlety, valuable though that is at times, not in the capacity to pass examinations, important though that may often be in moulding one's career in life, but in the inculcation by precept and example of ideas of honour, probity, sincerity—in a word, character. True and substantial education, whether of an individual or of a nation, can be acquired only by a process extending over years or generations. An individual or a nation, however advanced or cultivated, may often find something to learn from humbler persons and nations. One should, therefore, not be too conceited to keep one's faculties wide awake and to retain a receptive mind throughout one's active career.

A modern scientist now and again proves, what ought to be apparent to reason, that the bacillus of certain diseases multiplies greatly in air artificially befouled, but not in normal air. Likewise, under normal conditions the human mind, individual and national, would not be so susceptible of evil as when the

surrounding atmosphere is artificially befouled by associates and teachers. It is man's interest to keep everything he comes in contact with, or which he needs for the satisfaction of physical as well as moral wants, clean and healthy. Animals and vegetables, while they satisfy the appetites and help growth, also contribute to the infliction of disease and suffering. Rulers and teachers may similarly, while doing good in various ways, consciously or unconsciously inflict evil or retard development. In responsible positions, much more than in comparative freedom, it is essential to stand with courage and firmness against every form of wrong-doing and against satanic suggestion. It is easy for those in authority to discharge this primal duty and to control subordinates, but any lapse becomes fatal because no power exists to keep in order authority when it errs. Authority, when unchallenged but dutiful, talks about securing the good of the people under its care ; when it is dependent upon the goodwill of others, it talks about bowing to the will of the people ; but, except under compulsion of some sort, a position of privilege seldom allows the holders to perceive the desirability of favouring equality of opportunity. To talk about the good of the people and to resist every proposal to secure it may be a form of shrewd selfishness, but it is far from just or wise. This type of authority or privilege is, however, better than the manners displayed by another type in insulting the people that are in their power. If quarrels, rebellions, revolutions, and violence are to be avoided, ill manners, like crime, have to be expunged.

It is as harmful to the mind to submit to infamy or to look on unconcerned at the infliction of wrong as it is fatal for the authority of those that perpetrate it. Some take a pleasure in inflicting wrong, especially when they feel that they are safe from retaliation ; others bear wrong patiently in order to avoid quarrel ; and yet others, taking wrong silently, bear a grudge until vengeance is wreaked. The second attitude is perhaps the best for peace, but it encourages aggression. To deal with

average fellow-men, it is better to be possessed of a temper than to be meek, but one has to cultivate the art of showing it only when absolutely necessary, otherwise its abnormal development will injure one's own self. Constant irritability of temper is a sign of disturbance of nervous equilibrium proceeding from exhaustion ; hence opposition to a display of temper is as beneficial for the displayer's nervous system as for the self-respect of the person against whom it is displayed. Frequent excitement of the temper, like over-exercise of physical muscles, affects the heart as well, leading to serious troubles and even to sudden death. During life it produces, as in the case of a long spell of absolute power or slavish obedience, lassitude of the virile attributes of the mind. Serenity or evenness of temper under all circumstances, reasonable physical exercise, and useful occupation for the mind are the means of assuring health, happiness, and long life. The physical condition is so closely intertwined with the moral that the neglect of either retards advancement. The health and soundness of each have to be attended to simultaneously. Physical soundness is secured by suitable food, drink, exercise, fresh air, ablutions, and warmth. For mental health wholesome diet for the body as well as for the mind is necessary, to generate pure thoughts when awake and pleasant dreams in sleep. The attention to both is a part of good education.

Another equally important part of a good education is the acquisition of good manners. Good manners and tact combined with firmness are indispensable conditions of human advancement. They often undergo a severe trial when rudeness is encountered ; and, if it is frequently repeated, nature becomes suspicious and is apt to treat with brusqueness or coldness a stranger at the first encounter. This disposition needs control. It would be as justifiable to be always brusque or cold because some may deserve such treatment as it would be to treat everybody as criminal because some commit or have a disposition to commit crime. Men and women that by birth,

education, influence, rank, or wealth, become prominent leaders of society and exemplars for their compatriots and for mankind, absolutely must possess not only the gentlest breeding and manners but also correct demeanour at all times, courage without duplicity, and a strict standard of private morals.

As regards food and drink considerable difference of opinion prevails among different sections of mankind, and even among different classes. Some races thrive on meat, others on vegetables, and yet others on a mixture. Food, like sleep, is to a large extent more a matter of acquired habit than of necessity. Many people take more food than the system requires, others do not get enough. The poorer classes, who do the hardest work, get less meat than the well-to-do, who have no need to perform any manual labour; and yet the poorer are physically stronger than the richer class, and would also command better health and longer life if they could have anything like the housing and sanitary arrangements that are at the disposition of the well-to-do. For individual as well as for national development, one of the greatest and most urgent problems for rulers is how to secure to every member of the community under their care, not merely suitable food, but good housing, sanitation, and moral environment.

Vegetarianism is the practice of abstaining from the meat of killed animals; but eggs, fish, and cow's milk can hardly be classed under vegetarian diet. So far as abstention from meat depends upon the desire to avoid taking life, it ought to be borne in mind that vegetables, like animals, have life, and that one cannot breathe, eat, drink, or walk without injury to life in one form or another. To give effect to such compassion, one would have to live on dry leaves as they fall from the trees, and to drink only the water of hot-springs before it gets cool enough for insects to thrive in it; indeed, it would not be possible for man to live at all. So long as there is no intention of doing harm, there is no wrong done. On the other hand,

the excuse that unless killed and eaten animals would be so numerous as to be a nuisance may apply also to wild brambles, weeds, and sage-brush, which, although not eaten, do not cause man much inconvenience, and to insects and animals that are a positive nuisance but cannot be extirpated. Food, therefore, should be taken according to the nourishment it provides for moral and physical nature and to the wants of each individual system.

In the matter of drink, one would think that nature's provision of pure water, if it could be secured from a limpid mountain stream, is the best beverage. Other drinks made with a mixture of fruit or vegetables may be better as providing the system with some nourishment in addition to the needed moisture. Anything intoxicating the brain must be injurious, and can be needed only as a drug when one is fagged, to deaden the brain and give it rest. The deadening process too often applied may kill the brain or its functions altogether. Liquor, although not absolutely necessary in any climate, is not perhaps quite so injurious in northern as in southern latitudes. Owing to less perspiration than in warm climes, thirst is not so keen and a small quantity allays it. Taken in moderation or medicinally to ward off the effects of cold or to procure sleep, liquor may in cases be beneficial, but the difficulty lies in fixing the limit, and the desire for enjoyment more than for health appears generally to get the better of reason. Owing to the difficulty of observing moderation and to the injury done by the slightest excess, reasonable prohibition, at the present stage of education, is more desirable than permission or option. Drinks are intended to quench thirst, but no sane person, however thirsty, would consciously imbibe what he knows to contain poison, if the example set by associates and the growth of habit did not remove hesitation. In warm countries, where copious perspiration produces frequent thirst, liquor to quench it is apt to be taken in large quantities, and cannot but have the effect of a deadly poison.

Two of the greatest evils with which humanity individually and racially has to contend are intemperance and incontinence. Excess in food and drink, and want of self-control in sexual relationship, cause more physical maladies and mental weakness than all the bacilli of disease. Somebody has enunciated the maxim, "Sin in moderation and society will forgive you." Whether sinning in moderation is possible or pardonable, the satisfaction of the appetites beyond nature's requirements is not forgiven by nature. An Aryan sage has laid down the proposition with regard to the appetites that "the more one indulges in them the more they flare up like butter in fire, and the more one controls them the less they worry." This rule applies far beyond the appetites, for control is the law that governs humanity in all departments of life, and anything (or anybody) that gets out of control becomes a source of danger not only to others but to itself as well. Indolence of body and mind is often produced by enervating climatic conditions and by demoralising social institutions and traditional usages, but all these combined cannot do an individual or race any harm if the virility to control and regulate the appetites exists.

Mental indolence is also caused by the intoxication of success, of wealth, or of undeserved rights, quite as much as by intemperance. It is the general notion that education consists in the acquisition of general knowledge of various subjects, of a mastery of facts and figures, and of the faculty of comprehension of the motives and impulses of neighbours. These are all useful accomplishments, but they are more the results of outward influence than of intuitive culture. The best form of education is to train the mind to the exercise of the reasoning faculty, as to the way to live usefully, to think rationally, to discharge duty faithfully, and to work conscientiously. Without such education human life becomes brutal and miserable. A life of misery is torture, the only remedy for which is annihilation. Traditional ideas and a

sense of delicacy stand in the way of giving early training on the value of continence, which not only guards and preserves physical health and strength but develops the energies of the brain—its capacity for conception, creation, invention, and reception. The human mind does not attain its full glory and development by excelling in one single branch of knowledge or by prominence in one department of life, and not even by versatility in several subjects. These are in themselves grand achievements and, perhaps, as much as may be performed by man in the short span of allotted life and in the midst of a thousand distractions. It ought, however, to be his aim to attain divinity by being master of all departments of life and knowledge. The energy for such effort can be generated by continence alone, which should be impressed in early life by discipline and training. In modern life it is taught in an indirect way, and individual giants in intellect and mental power prove its possession by their exceptional genius and achievements. If it could be directly implanted in the mind at school and college, the moral illumination resulting from it would be found to facilitate the exercise of all the mental faculties without fatigue of body, which derives its strength from the brain. Continence is the easiest means of attaining individual excellence; and that nation becomes great, happy, and powerful, which has the largest number of continent men and women. It produces the potentiality for the perception of unity, which enables the mind to achieve and retain its balance under all circumstances. Eminent European medical men are coming to recognise, what the ancient Aryans believed, that a century is the natural span of healthy human life. They do not as yet appear to agree as to the observances that are necessary to extend life to its full span with the minimum of infirmity and suffering.

While continence is the most effective means of advancing individual happiness and strength, it has to be practised mentally as well as physically. To observe physical con-

tinence while thinking of incontinence does no good. The ancient Aryans, tired of the annoyances and struggles inseparable from life, concluded that continence can be best practised away from temptations, that happiness is attained from peace, and that peace is secured in solitude. The modern man (and woman) appears to be coming to something like the same conclusion, but, being fond of the comforts of life, does not wish to go into solitude, but to live amidst the struggle and whirl of life and yet to have as little worry as possible. So he is preferring more and more a life of "single blessedness," and abjuring the joys and responsibilities of family life as well as its attendant annoyances. The modern girl finds dance, dress, golf, hockey, shop-windows, and theatres more attractive than domestic duties and housewifery. Although the disinclination for matrimony on the part of both men and women may have serious consequences in the future by race suicide, it would at the present time be perhaps not altogether harmful if it developed the spirit of continence, smothered sex instincts, and induced the sexes to look upon each other as brothers and sisters.

Happiness comes essentially from mental peace, and mental peace proceeds from a perception of the unity by which individual, class, national, or racial good can be achieved through religion, society, and politics. The principle on which unity is based by religious teachers is the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This is also the principle by which social unity can be secured. There may be sectarian differences in religion, but so long as toleration and the spirit of charity exist, no rivalry need blind the sectaries to the unity of the goal to which all efforts tend. So in society, underneath a division into families and classes, may subsist a perception of the essential unity of all the groups forming the community. In politics, the highest national aspirations and achievements can be secured only when differences of language, religion, and race are subordinated to the unity of general

interest. Nationality, again, constitutes a unit in a fraternity of nations only when selfish obstacles disappear with the advance of noble aspirations and humanitarian enthusiasm. As in individual life a high sense of duty and its discharge bring contentment and happiness, as continence takes away the risk of languor of body and brain, so national life attains its ideal state when every individual member has the spirit of sacrifice called in Japan *Bushido*, and in India *Barjana*. The strength of individual and national life is perceived in the prevalence of grand ideas, in blindness to selfish considerations when work has to be done, in delightful and harmless abandon when work is over, and in the constant retention of perfect self-control and of faith in the eternal principles of justice and truth. In moments when temper and the weaker instincts of nature are provoked or sorely tried, the only way to retain balance of mind is to control ardent impulses by reason, and, while doing the best possible to subjugate the enemy, to have no thought of inflicting suffering. Thus can ideal life be attained with perfect freedom of development and gradual but steady dawn of light. Under such conditions all obstacles in the path of progress vanish. In the battle of life one can command courage when one does not fear death. The fear of death vanishes when self is merged in the omnipresent essence, when individual desires are expunged, and the identity of the individual self with the universal soul is realised. The way of freedom is, not to run away or have nothing to do with others, but to be unified with them. Worldly efforts are directed towards superficial uniformity ; the Divine method is to secure spiritual unity. Obstacles to national advancement are removed or minimised by the principle of government by the people, and by the due regulation of the relationship of classes ; the hindrances to individual beatitude are removed by the regulation of the spirit, for the spirit, and by the spirit.

By nature's law individuals are liable to assaults, physical and moral, which can no more be avoided than the attentions

of burglars, hooligans, and thieves can be eluded by householders or the well-to-do. The way to guard against such dangers is to maintain the vitality necessary to cope with them. Anything that interferes with the retention or growth of moral and physical vitality must be deemed an enemy of man, of order, and of peace. Ailments and maladies are often aggravated by ignorance, insufficiency of nourishment, and incontinence, but their origin lies in damp, dirt, and drink, and the roots must be extirpated before attention to the aggravating causes can bear lasting fruit. In the removal or control of such evils, fear of punishment more than a sense of duty is the driving force among races and the vast majority of individuals, and the more backward the race or the individual the greater is the need for the inspiration of fear ; but even among comparatively advanced races education has not become so genuine and widespread as to ensure reform from a sense of duty alone, while the disappearance of fear owing to the advance of freedom threatens to bring about anarchy and lawlessness with their inevitable consequences—confusion, misery, and wretchedness. In the first stage of education appeal to the interests of self is necessary because those interests are better understood than a sense of duty. Everybody is aware of the contrast presented in the care bestowed on one's own possessions with the indifference, negligence, and often positive mischievousness displayed towards the possessions of other people. The attitude quickly changes in proportion to the consciousness of the presence or absence of self in the object. The means to secure a happier condition is to extend the knowledge of self, and that ought to be the mind's first training.

In the extermination of evil and the advance of good the gentler sex appears to possess by nature and conditions of existence a larger potentiality than the mere man. As in national existence it is the province of the physically robust to fight battles and secure immunity from external enemies,

while the more purely intellectual and the refined have the care of the internal interests of the nation, so in family and social life man and woman have each distinct and separate functions, both equally important for happiness. According to established usage it is woman's part to be charming and attractive to man, but different spheres of influence are assigned to women at the various stages of mental development. At one stage, woman is made to be the helpmate of man; at another stage, to be the mother of the race; at a third stage, to be his rival. Whatever may be the sphere assigned to woman by nature, she has to be not merely the mother but the maker of man at the first stages of his life. Although, therefore, her position has been regulated by ancient tradition, which it is not easy to efface, man is slowly coming to change his ideas, but in this as in other matters the interests of predominant self create hesitation. Woman has to be man's partner, as man has to be woman's partner, each taking charge of the department in life for which each is best fitted. If dispute as to superiority or inferiority prevails, the result is the same as in the case of "a house divided against itself." Where co-operation, fellow-feeling, and sympathy prevail, both are enabled to discharge their respective duties, ensuring happiness for themselves and advancing the interests of mankind. As mother, sister, wife, and daughter, woman's function is to mould the destinies of her species. Under conditions where physical strength is held supreme, woman, not having equal muscular and nervous power with man, is assigned an inferior place. With the march of culture and intellect, conditions are being changed, and man and woman have both alike to decide whether they are to possess equal rights in every sphere of life or whether each should be content with the sphere for which each is most qualified by nature and endowment. Eminent opponents of the assertion of woman's claims to the wider sphere ridicule equality because they think that the physiological distinction of sex carries with it divergence of mental

and moral aptitudes. They ignore the fact that such divergence is often due to causes other than physiological difference, and that, although, as in the human frame each limb is made to discharge a particular duty yet receives its vitality from the heart for which each has to work, so man and woman as different limbs of society have separate functions, yet, in proportion as their mental and moral aptitudes approach, they are able to help each other in life.

Attempts have at all times been made by thoughtful minds to place the relationship on a satisfactory basis so as to ensure the happiness and development of each without awakening selfishness and rivalry. The ancient Aryans, who enjoined that every man at a certain age had to be married, inculcated the principle that all women—except one's wife—were to be regarded as mother. In later times, with the comparative bluntness of sexual ideals and with the encroachments of people of grosser notions, Aryan man deemed it necessary to keep his womankind in bondage in order to save them from worse slavery. In modern times it has pleased man, being less disposed to enter into matrimony, to liberate her from bondage and lock-up, but, instead of affording her equal opportunities of development and equal consideration and chances in the struggle of life, to gratify her with finery and superficial worship, not as an Aryan mother but as a toy made for man's play. In spite of habit and tradition, woman has advanced enough to be able to guide her own destiny and that of man. She need not be afraid of losing anything by retaining her natural endowment of mental, moral, and physical charms, and she may at the same time assert her just right to develop and exercise all her faculties for the good of mankind. At the present time, the position of woman is best in Britain and the United States, and the respect accorded to her is highest in Britain. In Germany women have the reputation, as personal intercourse with German families would testify, of making better mothers and more devoted wives. Hence,

perhaps, in spite of a repressive oligarchy, Germans have advanced in every department of life owing to happiness at home and to a good training and start in life. How much more would nations that enjoy greater political freedom advance if they could secure such dutiful mothers and devoted wives !

Neither equality nor subjection in the relationship of man and woman, any more than in that of man and man, or of woman and woman, will advance happiness ; there is more hope in partnership and co-ordination in matters in which they can help each other. Two forces in nature can never be absolutely equal, nor can any two men be equal in strength or power or prestige, or two women be equal in beauty or capacity. If they were, there would not be prizes awarded for championship or beauty. The law of nature is variety, and to attempt to bring about uniformity is going against that law. Virile effort should be directed towards unity and co-operation based on mutual respect, so that, while each force may please itself by considering itself to be the most important and indispensable unit, it should not permit that thought to proceed to the extent of attempting to assert superiority to the other force. Generous co-operation and dutiful co-ordination would make all human relationship, whether of the sexes, of races, of classes, or of individuals, happy and divine.

According to the ideas of many of her own sex as well as of her admirers in the other sex, woman will be in danger of losing her beauty, charm, and grace, if she takes to physical exercise or to intellectual advancement. They attribute to woman the characteristics of effeminacy. It is for women themselves to prove that such estimate of their character is incorrect ; and many women have already afforded ample proof. Experience shows that physical beauty is enhanced by sufficient exercise in fresh air, and that the development of mental faculties not only endow women with an intellectual expression of features but equalise their opportunities in the

struggle of life with man, as in the case of men themselves. Equality may, according to opponents, interfere with matrimony; but fondness for finery and frivolities is proving a stronger bar to marriage than physical strength or moral and mental qualification can possibly do, and equality will have the advantage of basing unions on a feeling of real partnership, and not as hitherto of domination and subordination.

Apart from the question what sort of woman makes a good wife and mother, or what type of man makes a dutiful husband and father, which is a matter of individual choice and taste, a very serious problem is involved in the question of matrimony: namely, when and how it should be entered into, and whether the State, looking to the good of the community, should permit it whenever individuals may choose to get married or should impose some check on individual action. Certain marriages, although apparently undesirable when solemnised, prove a blessing for the couple; others, although apparently desirable in every way, prove unhappy both for the couple and for the issue. Conclusions formed by individuals are based on particular instances. As a matter of freedom of action, it may be left to each individual to do what he likes and to enjoy or to suffer the consequences of his act, which, as education advances, will be regulated by prudence. The only question for the State is whether it should tolerate marriages that add to the community members that are paupers, insane, diseased, or otherwise inefficient and burdensome. The life of such members of a community is as miserable as the dangers they create are serious. If the State undertakes the duty of providing for the safety and welfare of the community, it is a part of its duty to regulate social matters according to the ideas of its best and most prominent men and women. In this as in other affairs, social, political, religious, and economic, the will of the majority must prevail, the minority having the right to free criticism and to every legitimate endeavour to influence public opinion. Interference with the system of

free marriage may, as has in some countries been the case, produce illicit unions, illegitimate offspring, and want of conjugal, filial, and parental affection. It is to be hoped that in those countries blessed with better education and with a growing sense of responsibility such a tendency will gradually diminish and disappear. The duty and the right of the State, which in civilised communities now limits the age of consent, to regulate a matter like marriage, so vital to the welfare of the community, cannot be denied.

Though beauty—like power, strength, and wealth—may be turned to wrong uses by its possessor and by its professing admirers, yet, rightly understood, it may prove beneficial in every way to advance human happiness. The influence of beauty, whether for good or for evil, depends upon the sentiment with which it inspires its admirer as well as upon the training of the mind of beauty and its beholder. A thing of beauty, apart from its spiritual or moral attributes, is not only a joy but elevating for the mind. It lifts the beholder to venerate the Creator, and to try to emulate in his productions the sublime type so much admired and appreciated in nature. A beautiful mother, sister, or daughter does not inspire with any unworthy sentiment even a man that possesses neither culture nor self-control. Freer intercourse between man and woman, together with an advance of education that will enable both to converse on intelligent topics and to feel a fraternal affection, will bring about the happy relationship of the family circle produced by pure thought and by common participation in the same joys and sorrows of life.

Desire and duty are antagonistic. Desire is selfish; duty is self-sacrifice. By worldly persons the discharge of duty is associated with gain, and reward is expected when duty is discharged to the satisfaction of superiors. Others in the discharge of duty become busybodies, are anxious to display the importance of their position, and unnecessarily interfere with people with whom they have no legal or moral right to inter-

fere. Duty in such cases is not self-sacrifice ; but, so long as wickedness and worldliness exist, the discharge of duty at personal risk, although it may be for personal gain as well, must be laudable. Duty in its highest and noblest aspect consists in the discharge of an obligation undertaken with or without consideration to the best of one's ability, even if it entails loss or death. As soon as reward is looked for or expected, duty ceases to be sublime.

Desire has two aspects, as all worldly matters have : good and evil. Evil desire—that is, desire for personal gain at the expense of another—is always blamable, and indirectly as well as directly it is productive of mischief. Good desire in a life of worldliness advances human happiness, but it cannot be wholly beneficial or reliable unless all idea of personal gain or reward by the satisfaction of the desire is relinquished. Desire is generally associated with matters the gain of which becomes the purpose of the mind without a thought of the initial difficulties and dangers towards its satisfaction or of the consequences that may follow such satisfaction. It also takes the forms of discontent and grumbling. Discontent is the nurse of progress ; grumbling is a sign of helplessness. Existence based wholly on a sense of duty, according to the circumstances in which one may be placed, without the slightest tinge of desire or of selfish gain, is the ideal that makes man divine. Such a sense is the source of virility, which secures prosperity and is found more in those that attain prominence than in those that inherit it.

Next to perception of unity and sense of duty, practical idealism consists in recognising that others have valid claims to live and thrive, and that in all matters of life views different from one's own may be held by others in perfect honesty. It is worldliness, as well as patriotism or philanthropy, to induce others to accept one's view. Attempts have very commonly been made by persons having power to impose their view on others by coercion, and such attempts have often been success-

ful. In the case of militant religion, for example, the attempts succeed because after compulsory conversion the converts have no other resource than to accept the beliefs that have been forced upon them. Such conversion indeed becomes a sort of slavery ; but all religions that use coercion and other worldly methods lose in time their divine and spiritual nature and become human or brutal. Until a free expression of all views and from different standpoints is permitted or enjoyed, and until every one is given the chance of inducing others to accept his view, true freedom or real unity cannot be attained. Social equality or union, like physical uniformity, is unattainable, but the unity that proceeds from common aims, ambitions, desires, and interests is bound gradually to prevail if no contempt, jealousy, or rivalry is entertained by one class against another, each recognising the force of circumstances that places itself as well as others at different stages of progress along the same road, like soldiers in the van or the rear of battle. In such unity, social or religious differences may, like difference of opinion on other matters, exist without risk of conflict, and toleration forms the basis on which co-operation for common ends rests.

An easy way of attaining happiness in daily life is to observe moderation, to avoid complacency, to secure unity of purpose by adherence to high principles and ideals, to concede to others the utmost freedom consistent with their duty to the corporate life, to help to assure to every neighbour a happy home and healthy environment, to resist every aggressive action, and to cripple aggressors from doing possible future injury. Enduring and keen happiness can also be enjoyed by serving fellow-men that happen to be in need of help. Worldliness on the part of those that are so served may hinder recognition of the service, which may be attributed to interested motives ; but the good and true render help for the satisfaction of their own sense of propriety, not to earn gratitude or reward. In rendering any service, or in doing good otherwise, it is necessary to

avoid a tone of condescension or an attitude of contempt. An old custom enjoined the washing of the feet of beggars on a certain day, but the washer always took care to make it clear that the act was unusual condescension: such a spirit can hardly be called humility, which the custom was intended to foster.

Another method is to undergo the training from as early an age as possible. Such training requires one to subject the appetites and passions to control and discipline, to use them, like a trained army, when justifiable, to recognise that they exist in all fellow-creatures, who have an equal right to make use of them along the right lines, and to resist their improper use by others. First youth is the time not only for training, but also for acquiring independence of conduct and of thought.) The easiest of all processes of training is to realise that, as one behaves towards others, so will others behave in return when opportunity presents itself; and that, if one's superior strength or favourable position may for the time give one an advantage, others will try to gain the upper hand and retaliate, if not on the holder, whose span of life may end to escape the consequences, yet on his successors.

Individual illness would vanish if every one could avoid pride in health and strength, and would observe the laws of nature made uniformly for all creatures, with possible momentary change of application. The neglect of the old principle that prevention is better than cure is the occasion of much suffering. Cure may take away illness and continue existence, but every illness is bound to undermine the system. Physical ailments can be avoided or prevented by leading a simple life—keeping the body and the pores of the skin clean by baths, by eating in moderation and at regular intervals nourishing food, by dressing sensibly, by resting brain and muscle whenever there is a feeling of fatigue, by sleeping for a definite number of hours (too much sleep dulls energies and too little causes lassitude), by taking daily exercise in the

open air within the limit of fatigue, and above all by training the mind to patience and serenity at every incident in life so as to avoid elation in success or depression in failure. If in spite of all this care illness comes and causes suffering, it has to be relieved by science and medical help; in the absence of suffering no extraneous help is needed, and one has only to observe natural laws and to keep quiet in room or in bed. Convalescence is helped by avoidance of haste to resume the usual routine of life. On regaining health, to remember the attack and to exercise in strict moderation the faculties endowed by nature, to keep them sharp and to prevent their decay by abuse or strain—this is the secret of health and longevity.

With the advance of education and increase in the number of educated people, new discoveries are naturally being made in all departments of inquiry. Science has not yet discovered remedies for all physical ills, and notably for some dread diseases that baffle human effort; but remedies for existing ills are sure to be found eventually, while new forms of disease will also make their appearance. Where healthy conditions exist, dread forms of disease are rare, as is apparent from the fact that the well-to-do generally escape the diseases that are caused by unhealthy surroundings. But physically healthy conditions are not all. In addition, healthy moral conditions have also to be observed. In child-life physical conditions are more important, but in adolescence and manhood physical and moral conditions are equally urgent. No good can come of observance of physical conditions if bad temper, luxuries, dissipation, and incontinence are indulged in, and are permitted to sap the vigour of life. While measures for the prevention of disease are adopted, suitable moral teaching and the formation of character should at the same time receive attention. Without pure, noble, generous, and humane thoughts, no amount of healthy physical environment will diminish man's liability to distemper and disease. Impure

thoughts and development of selfishness, as crude ideas of human needs and rights and of equality spread, will create much greater danger for the happiness of mankind than any mere physical ills can ever do. The best means of warding off moral and physical inroads on health is to build up an organism with sufficient powers of resistance, endowing it with vitality to recover speedily after an unavoidable attack. In the indirect methods of prevention the strengthening of the nervous system plays a very considerable part. In the case of certain dreaded encounters, as in battles with human foes, it is unquestionable that nervousness causes disaster. Anything done to weaken the nervous system either in individuals or races is a source of mischief, and those that take advantage of their position and deliberately encourage or compass such weakening are enemies of human welfare.

In physical existence, unity has been sought by man in the spirit of nationality, which has taken the place of unity under one Crown. When man found himself confronted with the difficulties, dangers, and vicissitudes inseparable from life, he began to devise means to minimise them, so that they should do him as little harm as possible. He discovered in a primitive stage the advantage of co-operation among individuals faced by similar dangers and trials. This co-operation naturally brought about sympathy and a sort of affection based on self-interest. The human mind at its birth finds itself among strange surroundings, but the care and tenderness of its new associates make it fond of them, and, as it grows up, more and more strongly attached to them. This attachment and the feeling of partnership in joys and sorrows produce that family tie which is the origin of organised society. Several families, neighbours living close to each other, often meeting each other, facing similar dangers and difficulties, and participating in similar enjoyments, come to be attached to each other like members of the same family, and find it advantageous to co-operate in many departments of life. The

grouping of families in villages united for common purposes laid the basis of the feeling of attachment and interest; and this feeling, gradually expanding to embrace more villages, brought into being the idea of nationality, unknown to the ancient world, but at the present day the strongest bond of human cohesion. Nationality is man's idealism in political life, because there can be no limit to its expansion, and because it is at present the only basis on which individuals and classes otherwise separated and divided by clashing interests feel their unity. Until the spread of suitable culture makes the masses in every country and in every age feel their moral unity, as men and women of the highest culture and progressive instincts now feel, although they may not belong to the same motherland, nationality will continue to be the pivot on which the structure of idealism based on unity will have to be reared.

Nationality is at the present time a grouping of individual entities brought together, like a corporate body, for certain ends. The existence of dangers from surrounding tribes and races not amenable to national feeling led to the adoption of natural barriers—mountain-ranges, rivers, and seas—to form the boundaries within which peoples with certain common interests might with comparative safety maintain themselves. Among these peoples, families, and individuals, there is often jealousy and strife for selfish ends. In case of danger from distant people, jealousy and common interests are placed on different scales: if jealousy triumphs, the foreigner comes in and gets a footing, while the preponderance of common interests saves and strengthens national independence. Statesmanship consists in laying stress on the importance of national interests and in minimising internal differences.

In addition to common interests and dangers, nationality is further based on the idea of brotherhood promulgated by great religious teachers. Their teaching is directed to secure the triumph of love for the sake of love itself. Such theory of

love is too abstract for the comprehension of minds to which physical considerations are of greater importance, and nationality is therefore the easiest way to secure physical brotherhood. Death, although it can never be eluded, is considered to be the greatest evil that can befall an individual. To unreflecting and uninformed minds that look upon physical existence as the individual the dissolution of matter or its separation from mind appears to be the end of all. A particular combination of mind and matter may in course of nature appear and disappear, as everything having a beginning must have an inevitable end, but the essential part of either mind or matter cannot die. It is immortal and bound to live in some form or other after its apparent dissolution—either as an individual entity again or else as a portion of one or more other entities. If one leaves no children, one is taken to disappear physically, but one may in life have contributed imperceptibly to the formation or development of matter in various ways. The action of the mental part is more perceptible; and, unless one lives in seclusion from birth to death, one cannot help spreading around oneself a net of physical and moral influence whose effects one's disappearance cannot obliterate.

The finest product of Asiatic thought has been humanitarianism. The best gift of European culture to mankind has been its power to kindle nationalism. The two great principles that are at work to mould human destiny may, in their course of development, appear antagonistic. Humanitarianism must be blind to faults, and seek its end through self-sacrifice. Nationalism must be alert and pushful, and seek its aims by the sacrifice of others. The one principle wishes to secure human brotherhood, the other the brotherhood of a group. Both have one common object—to afford to all within their respective spheres a sense of common interests and high culture. As nationalism spreads and secures a strong hold of every group and section of mankind, it cannot but

develop into humanitarianism. Its action is evident at the present day among the peoples of Europe. Its influence is spreading among the peoples of Asia. When two forces, similar or dissimilar, are brought together, they are bound by the circumstances of the union to exercise mutual influence, to imbibe good or evil as each may have good or evil to communicate, and to help or to instruct each other in the unavoidable destiny in store for every force created by nature. The strength of the national force is regulated by individual character, and the character of individuals, while based on original endowment, is regulated very largely by their associations and environments—by infant nursing, early guardianship, teaching, and companionship in youth, and throughout life by the atmosphere in which they live and move. A useful or a worthless life is of considerable importance to an individual's own self; it may also have great and prolonged influence on others by the example it sets and the precepts it conveys; but, as it is finite and disappears sooner or later, its influence generally ends with its existence or at any rate it becomes less with the advance of time, except in the case of a few commanding personalities, whose thoughts and acts are admired and revered in future ages, and who continue always to be beacons to guide those they influence along the right path. There can be no better test of greatness or usefulness than the power of influencing fellow-men generations after one's bones are dust. The power to influence contemporaries is the next best test of usefulness.

Nations, unlike individuals, have an eternal life. History records the case of nations—or, more correctly, races—that have become extinct like the Mammoth and the Dodo; but, properly speaking, although their ancient customs, laws, and religions have apparently disappeared, they have in fact become merged in other races, and have given birth to the nations of modern times. The conditions under which races and States existed and fought in ancient times are changed. It is not

possible at the present day or in the conceivable future for any nation or State to exterminate another with which it comes in contact. The character and institutions of one nation may be changed by close contact with another differing in diverse ways, as in individual human companionship; they may, like husband and wife, be indissolubly linked in happy partnership, each helping the other with the faculties, attributes, and possessions that each has at command, and both together may advance towards the fuller life that such partnership naturally achieves; but neither can ever lose its distinguishing nature and traits, or assume the figure, features, and dominating characteristics of the other.

The ideal that great minds have set for the guidance of mankind, the ideal that has become the goal of human effort in the highest developed races, is Freedom. Freedom, so far as it can be achieved in this life, is relative; it cannot possibly be absolute, since individuals in a community are mutually dependent, and nations are becoming daily more and more interdependent in spite of reactionary attempts to keep them asunder. The idea of freedom has become crystallised into impatience of material control. Independence of the flesh, whether of one's own or of another's, is impossible of attainment so long as flesh is identified with self. Resentment at interference, when interference is not necessary for the general good, is what is taken to be freedom, but it is only the negative side of freedom. Its abnormal development is noticeable in certain types that deem it right to push, jostle, and inconvenience others—chiefly those that refrain from resenting such treatment or are unable to retaliate. The positive scope of freedom lies in the unfettered development of both mind and body, so far as such development is under human control, in order to command physical health and vigour without risk of attack from inimical natural forces, and to gain mental peace and happiness, which in human conceptions may be described as divine.

The aim of all culture and manhood is to secure this freedom. In its course, however, it may develop certain undesirable symptoms due to evil tradition and to influences that prove that human efforts meet with opposition and disappointment in order to lead not to despair but to greater exertion and perseverance. It is easy to influence by advice, example, and guidance those whose disposition is in the right direction. To help and rescue individuals and nations before they have gone far on the road to ruin, though difficult, is yet attainable. Advice and guidance come too late, indeed, when the mind has been enfeebled by the poison of greed, selfishness, and pleasure; yet even in that state it is possible to influence a few for good. Efforts under adverse conditions can be made only by those whose intuition prompts them that existence does not end with the last breath of one's body. In lectures and homilies people talk of sacrifice when they try to induce others to be good or to do good. To be good is no sacrifice, since it benefits self; to do good is no sacrifice either, because it advances the interests of the community. It is an honour and a privilege to serve neighbours, because such service identifies the server with the served and advances the unification of society.

There are always eminent specialists that are convinced of the absolute fitness of the recumbent position of individuals, classes, and races that happen to be down. Such unhappy people would be blamable if they had brought the misfortune on themselves by neglect or defiance of the laws that govern human well-being. According to current notions, however, as society is organised, there must be some that are up and others that are down, and some cannot be up unless others are down: which of these are the more necessary elements in nature it may be difficult to determine. Each set, of course, deems itself important; but it is evident that, if the situation were natural, those that are up would never come down, and those that are deemed fit for recumbency could never rise.

The ideal arrangement is, not that there should be none up and none down, or that those that are up should ill-treat those that are down, but that, whatever may be the position occupied whether by choice or by compulsion, the duties appertaining to such position should be discharged in the best possible manner, while efforts at amelioration should be made without neglect of those duties, and without the intoxication of conceit on the one hand or, on the other, the misery of despondency.

In human affairs, as in the sciences, there are matters that are difficult to verify, and consequently have to be taken according to probabilities, which are determined by the disposition and sympathy of the mind. Hence for advancement of good these have to be cultivated, so that one may be able to take the probabilities in the best possible light. If applause or success is deemed more important than truth, sympathies get crooked. It is not solely by considerations for the present or by contemplation of the past that progress towards unity can be continued, but also by hope and enthusiasm, which are the sources of the vitality enabling the mind to create the condition to which it aspires. The alternative to unity is isolation, from which to hostility there is but a short step. To promote racial toleration and co-operation, no less than other studies the study of social and moral agencies, which influence for good or evil the racial tendencies of future generations, is of profound importance, and yet it has hitherto been much neglected. When it is earnestly taken up, it will show that racial progression or retrogression depends, not solely on heredity by birth, but very largely on the associations that heredity entails, and these associations urgently need regulation for the good of man.

If consideration for fellow-men ceases to govern human conduct, and if idolisation of self becomes the motive of existence, physical force becomes supreme in the world. Superior persons and superior races would consider it their duty, not to set a good example to persons and races that

they regard as inferior, not to try to elevate them lest they should come up to their own level, but to retain their superiority by force, with the result of lowering themselves by contagion to the level of the inferior force. The inferior persons and races, on the other hand, finding that physical and not moral force secures superiority, would direct their ambitions towards the betterment of their condition by physical force alone, and human struggle would be directed to gain, not moral superiority, but brute strength to coerce fellow-men. Such an undesirable state of things might be avoided by a general advance in culture, in training, and in discipline, by the cultivation of gentlemanly feeling, and, above all, by early inculcation of the maxim that one's neighbour is constituted as one's self. The truth has yet to dawn on mankind that principles of morality and of justice hold good between different races and peoples, as well as between individuals in the same community.

Worship of Divinity has for centuries in various forms—generally gross, material, or showy, such as may appeal to unsophisticated nature—played a great part in human motives and action. Worship of God is performed in two ways—active and quiescent; the first, by open rites, alone or in company, at a recognised place of worship, and by pious acts to fellow-beings; the second, by silent meditation and by abstention from wrong-doing. The different modes are suited to different stages of development. Meditation is always beneficial, as it withdraws the mind from worldliness; but anything in the nature of display, pomp, or fear, takes away the reverence that religion was instituted to awaken in the mind. Theology has done its work, which Science has taken up. In modern life, fear has been rightly discarded as an effeminate attribute of the mind, and fear of God or of ultimate consequences must naturally also grow less. Godhead is perfection of the qualities of father and mother, and as such can never inspire fear. In its place conscience and sense of

duty must govern human conduct and keep every one in the path of virtue and truth. As a sage has said—

Sāstra yatna bichārebhyo mūrkhānām prapalāyinām
Kalpitā Vaishnavi bhaktih prabrit्यartham subhasthitau.

(“For the stupid that are disposed to run away from Scriptures, from efforts, and from reason, fear of God has been devised to keep them in the path of virtue.”)

When every nation, like individuals in a community, is governed by conscience and sense of duty, animosities and rivalries must give place to brotherhood and common endeavour for universal good and happiness. Theology is useful at a certain stage of the mind to produce the conviction of human brotherhood. Ideal religion should not lay down any fixed rules of life, but only general principles such as the great unitarian religions promulgate; and it should indicate the direction to which all aspirations for happiness must tend. Unity is not promoted by a union of those that are of the same persuasion and by war with those that differ. Real unity recognises the existence of difference of judgments as of physical features, and tries to secure co-operation for common ends by obliterating differences through understanding them. Assimilation by coercion, or by attempts to smother free expression of opinion and the free development of individual judgment, can secure only a semblance of union, while it sows seeds of discord and disruption. The predominance of a majority secures union when the minority is submissive; but, whenever the natural law of variety is ignored and the right of all opinion to tolerance and patient hearing is suppressed, disunion inevitably results. In spite of differences and divergencies, moral union may exist where enthusiasm for high ideals guides the thoughts and acts of a large number, and where self-sacrifice—the subordination of selfish to common interests—is recognised as the principle of the highest moral code.

Unity is apparently desired by everybody as the way of securing happiness. The difference lies in the method. One method is to foster fellow-feeling and co-operation through identity of interest and sentiment. This is the unity at which idealists aim. Another method gives but a superficial unity : however divergent the interests or sentiments of all may be, it aims at making a class or a few individuals paramount, and at compelling the rest to submit to these. The force needed for compulsion can be gained only by inducing a number of the opposing or indifferent class to side with the dominant class against their own order. In domination in any form real unity is sacrificed and separation and treachery are encouraged.

Rulers and statesmen may labour to reform society and to advance human happiness by placing laws on the Statute Book, but something more than legislation is needed to lead society to the ideal stage. Adequate steps by competent workers in all departments are needed to secure the full use of the instruments forged by human skill to remove human backwardness. Legislation is meant to remove disabilities that stand in the path of advancement, and must proceed on the lines of such removal ; those that have to carry the laws into practice are charged with the delicate and difficult function of applying the principles of the law to the facts of actual life, and of reconciling them to the minds of the people.

Any partnership or other relationship in which all the duties are on one side and all the rights on the other cannot be beneficial to either. A mistake is often made as to duties and rights according as one has to discharge the former or to enjoy the latter. The selfish nature of man looks upon every right it enjoys or wishes to enjoy as a matter of divine ordination, and upon every duty it has to discharge as coercion and oppression. Those whose moral fibre is loosened by opportunity or unquestioned power to enjoy a right do not

relish criticism or opposition, which they deem to be interference with freedom or authority. It should, however, be borne in mind that rights and duties are, like commodities of daily life, interchangeable or exchangeable. The happiness of life consists in so adjusting them as to make a fair exchange. It happens sometimes that a measure is good, but its utility is destroyed by the human instruments that carry it out. Similarly a system may be good or bad, but its beneficent or maleficent effect rests on the persons that administer it. Every measure and system should have one underlying object—to advance culture and help freedom of development.

True Freedom cannot be gained without culture, and *vice versa*. They have to go hand in hand. Both have to pass through various stages of development, and abuse or misuse at any stage retards and often prevents arrival at the goal. Freedom must at all times be careful to purge itself of the slightest taint of license or selfishness. Culture must be of a lofty type, aiming at the attainment of the highest ideals. Freedom does not mean, as it is daily being developed in large areas of population, liberty to do as one pleases, to live for and by one's own self, and to recognise no duty private or public to neighbours or friends. In organised society there cannot be absolute freedom : it has to be regulated by law until every individual recognises his obligations and attains dutifulness, if not perfection. Where there is law, there is restraint—control by one's own self or by others ; and, where restraint in any form is necessary either to induce one to abstain from certain acts or to make it obligatory to discharge certain duties, absolute freedom cannot be said to exist.

It is the duty of every good citizen to see that authority commands obedience. It is equally important that such obedience should be based, not on fear and coercion, except for the unruly and irreconcilable, but on affectionate respect ; and that the holders of power should always bear in mind that the evil they do will live after them and entail sad conse-

quences for all time, while the good they do is generally short-lived and likely to end with their disappearance. In this, as in every other department of human affairs, the influence of satanic darkness is noticeable, while flashes of light seem to come occasionally to awaken momentary hope, but to leave a more dismal darkness behind.

Rulers and teachers of mankind may be classed under three heads—actual, potential, and passive. Every human being comes under one of the three categories, sometimes changing from one to another. Every one in some way or another exercises sway, first, over his household or relations, next, over associates and companions, and thirdly, over the general community and the State. The influence may be more or less restricted or remote, friendly or hostile, but contact in any form with any fellow-creature—human, animal, or vegetable—exercises some change, perceptible and quick, or imperceptible and slow, on both mind and body through the nerves. The proverbs, "The servant is the master of the man," "The child is the ruler of the household," have thus a much wider significance than usually understood. Every individual has a conscious or unconscious influence on others, but consciousness or wilful unconsciousness carries responsibility. Every one, be he absolute monarch, chief, or ruler, has also at times to act the part of a subject or pupil or subordinate, and to shape his life or conduct by the guidance or influence of others.

Existing human institutions, against which democracy is rising to wage war, are based upon domination and subordination, upon the subjection of one sex to another, of one race to another, of one nation to another, of one class to another, and of one individual to another. They assume the inferiority of the subject individual or class when that individual or class cannot by force assert mastery. The assumption is based on physical strength, which pervades all animal nature, but which in the case of man is becoming more and more unimportant,

since improved firearms discharged from a safe distance are taking the place of hand-to-hand encounter, and since tactics does more than physical strength to secure victory. The advance of humanity depends on recognition of the right of every individual and class, race and sex, to have a free hand in fashioning their own life and in securing its unfettered development.

In every organised society some individuals must necessarily be the symbols of authority, and in a sense dominate over their fellows. But they have to remember that in the shifting sands of time and of life the domination is attached, not to their persons, but, as in the case of judges and magistrates on the Bench, to the position they hold, and that to prove themselves worthy of the confidence reposed in them and of the respect of those over whom they dominate, they have to feel with the latter a unity of ideals, of sentiments, and of thoughts. Therein lies their chance of lasting usefulness to the community whose destinies they are enabled by circumstances to control. Power, like love, brings good only when self does not step in to misguide its potency and usefulness. As Christianity, in spite of persecution, tyranny, and bloodshed, saved Europe from bigotry and superstition, and introduced the idea of equality; as Buddhism, Vaishnavism, Islam, and Theism have tried to suppress idolatry and priestcraft in Asia, and to proclaim human brotherhood; so successful revolt against the abuse of authority and position has produced in advanced individuals and sections of mankind a love of freedom—freedom from interference by others, freedom of development of the mind and body in all directions. Such freedom when applied in all desirable directions, is healthy and beneficial; but when, like abuse of power by persons in authority, it is wrongly directed, it hurts both the possessor and those that come under its influence. Under the garb of individualism it nurses selfishness. It attempts to deny to others the right to similar claims or possessions. It sets

up a form of personal idolatry more dangerous than the worship of God in the shape of clay, stone, or wood. The images intended for Godhead can do neither good nor harm ; human idolatry demoralises the idol as much as it degrades the worshipper. From denial to others of equal rights and opportunities its progress towards license to do wrong where wrong can be safely inflicted is continuous. Individual and national freedom is the only safe road to happiness ; but, when it is used for wrong ends, to inflict suffering in order to secure temporary gain, to display indifference towards the higher principles of conduct, it proves its unfitness to advance human welfare.

As in case of freedom, the average unsophisticated mind is indifferent to virtue or vice, and in the absence of coercion, legal or personal, is apt to be virtuous or vicious according to its association or self-interest. There are and have always been a few persons in every land who may be called sublimely virtuous, who are incapable either in thought or act of straying from the strict path of right and virtue, whatever be the inducements to such divergence. A community where the number of such individuals is large, or where they exercise sufficient influence in the State politically and socially, is the most favourably placed in the struggle against Satan and wrong, and has the best chance of moulding human destiny. On the other hand, there are also some whose minds are bent on mischief, and who, even when there is no appreciable personal gain, find a pleasure in doing wrong and in injuring others. Law and social securities are needed to keep them in order, and instruments of good have to exercise constant watchfulness to curb the prevalence of evil.

Laws are made not for the righteous and dutiful, but for the disobedient and criminally disposed. Authority is made to help the cause of human progress while guarding society from the criminal and lawless. Armaments are made to fight the armed enemy and to repel aggression, not for use

against the unarmed or ill-armed or innocent. Wealth is made to help the needy, and not the well-to-do. Medicine is made to cure suffering, not to be administered to the healthy. Power is made to help the weak and oppressed, not to truckle to the strong or to support such as can help themselves. Cleverness is made to disseminate wisdom and knowledge among the ignorant, not to keep itself in seclusion or to associate with its equal. Mastery needs to be considerate, and service to be willing and dutiful. Social position is made to impart good manners to the uncouth, not for mutual admiration. Any deviation from the object for which a person or thing is made is an abuse or misuse of opportunity, which proceeds from selfishness and continues human ills. One should remember that one cannot come in contact with other sentient beings without receiving or communicating good or evil. What is received or communicated is generally mixed, but in special cases more good than evil, and in other cases more evil than good, is received or communicated. It is a game of chance as to what the contact may produce, because the result depends upon the humour of the parties at the moment. Thus unconsciously a good person may communicate evil or a bad person communicate good. Prejudice or sympathy has also something to do with the result. If through prejudice one avoids a person or race, it is possible to avoid infection of either good or evil, but the prejudice itself generates in the mind a condition as bad as communication of evil. Good and evil are also communicated by the food consumed both physically and morally, and thus even animals with which human beings deal are responsible for communicating either health or disease. In case of doubt or uncertainty, it is considered safe to avoid contact, but the safest and wisest course generally is not to have any prejudices or preconceived notions, favourable or unfavourable, but to shun or seek as experience may prove to be desirable.

Great teachers have prescribed meekness as the most desirable attribute of the mind. Its possession is always beneficial, but its display has often to be avoided. There are creatures for whom the iron hand is suitable, and there are also creatures on whom exterior sternness has greater effect than a velvet glove. The great principle in life is to be gentle to the gentle, and stern to the brutal, but never to lose the inner meekness, nor to forget that gentleness is politeness, humanity is civilisation, and readiness to defend the weak, suffering, and helpless is heroism. Mountain climbers, as persons fond of mountaineering are aware, never feel happy until they get to the top and can observe what is on the other side. The eagerness to get a view all round and to breathe the exhilarating air free from impurities and impediments gives them strength. So it is with idealism, which can never rest until it is satisfied that all legitimate attempts to end human miseries have been made. The ordinary mind, unable to explain success, calls it luck. The idealist knows no luck, but only the certain triumph of virtue over adverse forces. Such triumph will be achieved when the sense of responsibility, beginning with every home, pervades mankind.

A son, subject to the teaching and influence of parents, becomes in course of nature a father, from whom others take their cue. A pupil may in time become the teacher to the child of the preceptor. Even if, as in the social arrangements of Indian Aryans, one not born in a particular caste or division of society cannot become a teacher of another caste, the influence exercised in various ways by individuals in all positions in life, high or humble, with whom contact in any form takes place, cannot be avoided. Similarly, among nations and races, one nation or race occupying at one time the position of guide or ruler to another may in course of nature through its descendants be the ward or pupil of the latter. Even if such a revolutionary or radical

change in relationship may not take place, the influence for good or evil resulting from contact cannot be avoided. Hence the instinct of self-defence, as of self-aggrandisement, should lead every individual and every nation and race to observe the highest principles of morality and of justice in dealing with each other.

Observing evil effects of interference either in individual feuds or in international affairs, some idealists recommend a policy of non-intervention. Intervention at the sight of injustice or wrong or combat, whether between individuals or between nations, is a duty of every person and every race. Its avoidance is a sign of selfishness or timidity. In the case of individuals, other individuals that are morally or physically stronger and able to assert their superiority rightly intervene either individually or collectively to stop mischief. In the case of nations, interference is more difficult unless the interfering nation is prepared to enter into the combat, and by superior strength proceeding from unselfish as well as physical causes is able to secure the triumph of justice and right. Such a position has not yet been achieved, nor will soon be achieved, by any race or nation, simply because nations do not, like individuals or organised society, display unselfishness in dealing with others or a disposition to interfere for the sake of good without any thought of gain to themselves. It is possible to conceive a state of affairs when one or more nations will be cultured and morally strong enough to discard from their conduct and policy all taint of selfishness, and to act up to the highest principles of duty and right. They will then be able, like guardians of law and order in a community, to command respect and to interfere successfully in international disputes to prevent bloodshed and misery. It ought to be apparent to every thoughtful mind that, so long as burglary or hooliganism in any form is permitted or condoned by a nation in international dealings, the evil effect of example of such condonation on individual ideas and conduct cannot be

avoided. It will demoralise many of the units in the nation itself to think of indulging in the pastime of selfish gain at the expense of others when it can be done with impunity. Individual wickedness thus becomes a reflection of national wrong-doing, and, to lead individuals to perfection, it is necessary for nations to be perfect.

It is a weakness of human nature, from which even clever and great men are not exempt, to consider oneself or one's family or nation to be indispensable to society, country, or mankind. In that consideration one omits the inevitable end of earthly careers. True greatness, strength, and wisdom of men and women, and far-seeing statesmanship, consist not merely in rendering all possible service according to opportunity, but also in creating and fostering the atmosphere that will produce a continuous succession of wise men and women, and great rulers. The neglect of this matter by leaders, rulers, and teachers, although themselves great, has always resulted in the decay and downfall of families, communities, races, and States. Fondness for frivolities and pleasures and the growth of selfishness on the part of some members would not diminish or endanger the safety and usefulness of the whole, if there were in every generation others that kept up the purity and salubrity of the moral and intellectual atmosphere that the existence of great minds at one time creates. Such an atmosphere continued for a few successive generations would bring about a disappearance of thoughtless expressions that bar the road to mutual respect and sympathy between one class and another, between one race and another, between one nation and another, and between one creed and another. Owing to traditional prejudices and antipathies, it is difficult enough to extend the sway of culture in order to advance human brotherly feeling ; but, when those prejudices are deliberately fanned by publicists that are presumed to be civilised, educated, and humane, and belong to any of the prominent nations of the day, the mischief done to mankind is incalculable. Except prodigies, no indi-

vidual or nation can attain any desirable object in life without help. That help, when deserved by ardent desire and virtuous effort, is provided by Providence. Ordinary human nature is not only disinclined to help struggling individuals and races, but disposed to be an obstacle in the way of their advancement. Hence, on achieving greatness or prominence, they look down with contempt upon others that are struggling. Whether the contempt produces the disinclination or *vice versa* it is difficult to trace, but like a tree and its seed the two go in a circle—one proceeding from the other. On a change in the attitude human welfare depends, and the change can come only when successful individuals and races help their struggling brethren, and the latter acknowledge their obligation by word and deed—by extending the same help to others that need it. The antidote to existing and possible future evil is the continuation of the moral qualities of leaders and rulers of men. Those that profess to be civilised and humane should do all that is possible by word and deed to extend discipline, training, love of order, and progress among all classes and races, and should not for the sake of momentary gain retard the efforts of far-seeing and generous minds to bring about a happier relationship among mankind. The feeling of brotherhood may be closer among members of the same community or among citizens of the same country or State, but it cannot without injury to one's moral perception be wholly discarded in dealing with other fellow-men.

Some people assert that material force rules the world, has ruled it in the past and will rule it in the future. If so, the lion, the tiger, and the elephant would have dominated over man, instead of man's becoming their master and gaoler. Others assert that moral strength alone rules the world. If so, the saints and the philosophers would always rule. Both schools are wrong. It is only by the combined strength of matter and mind that the world can be ruled. Matter alone may be dominant for a time, but, unless it can secure the help

of the mind, its dominance cannot last long. Meekness does not pay in conditions where physical force remains aggressive, but physical force combined with meekness or humanity would always be triumphant. A considerate and healthy partnership and a balancing of the two forces are necessary for mastery in the world. Similarly, aristocracy and democracy should be equally balanced, and no class should be allowed to have preponderating power in the State.

Individuals and nations once fallen can hardly rise again, especially if the fall is due to moral causes, to degeneracy and deterioration. Every rise requires considerable effort, but when it is effected the effort to retain the position seems to slacken, mainly because no danger seems near. The fall comes through conceit and complacency. All training and discipline must be directed to make the appearance of conceit and complacency impossible. It is human nature to notice dissimilarities, to point out to and teach the unsophisticated mind the differences in others from one's own self in physical appearance and moral attributes, and to conclude that diversity, being the law of nature, ought to be encouraged. But it is in proportion as these dissimilarities are overlooked, and the points of similarity and essential unity are noted, that mankind in any sphere of life is enabled to co-operate and to attain the efficiency that is the result of combination.

Owing to the strength of the resisting current of association, tradition, and training, and to the difficulty of the human mind's obliterating all its stains and commencing again its career with a clean page, it may be feared that advance along the road to happiness is barred; but despondency has never succeeded in achieving anything, and steady strenuous effort to make a clean sweep of evil, although the progress may be slow, will not only make the condition more favourable but prove the divine origin of the mind.

In all controversial matters between individuals, classes, or nations there are two methods of settlement, one peaceful and

the other warlike, one by consent and the other by combat. Human tradition has hitherto been for a warlike settlement, but such a settlement has never permanently settled disputes, which are renewed as soon as circumstances permit. Settlement by consent is coming to be more and more advocated on account of advance in culture, and the tremendous risks of modern warfare. It is to be hoped that lessons of history will be more efficacious, and that generosity, justice, and wisdom will guide the human mind in its selfish moods to enable good to triumph.

There are three ways of organising human society and institutions. One is to place absolute power in the hands of an oligarchy, who, if honest, cultured, and impartial, would certainly not permit any injustice or oppression by any person or class or race in the community they control. The second is to have authority spring wholly from the people. This method would certainly prevent oppression or injustice if the interests of the people do not clash with those of any class in the community, and if they receive sufficient education and training to perceive their duties and responsibilities and to avoid the intoxication of freedom and power. The third is to give free and equal opportunity to every individual and class to render service to the State in every sphere for which it may prove its fitness, the opportunity to prove fitness being generously and not too critically afforded at the commencement for a number of years with a view to the development of capacity, foresight, and the spirit of responsibility. The third course, in which all classes feel an equal interest in the progress and welfare of the State, and all individuals may emulate to acquire and to prove the greatest fitness, appears to be the most desirable system.

Emulation and effort are needed to produce among individuals the capacity for progress and self-government, and a ceaseless struggle for personal, political, religious, and social freedom is absolutely necessary to produce individual, national, and racial development. For the birth and growth of that

capacity the brain must be trained, perhaps for generations in continuous succession, not only by the best available literary, scientific, and technical education, but also by the most moral association. Any break in the training drives the brain back to its primitive incapacity. Idealism can be attained by a steady pursuit of the policy of Progress. Progress means the elimination of everything that becomes obsolete by advance in knowledge, science, and thought in every phase of life. Idealism thrives on patriotism, on humanitarian feeling, on undaunted enthusiasm, on moral force, and on the bracing atmosphere generated by the struggle with evil. As the safety of ships at sea and of conveyances on land depends upon each observing the rule of the road, the safety and progress of life can be secured only by the due discharge of obligations appertaining to every individual and every nation.

Idealism enjoins that human energies and activities should not be limited or cramped in any way. A book-lover may be unsympathetic to society, which he may think it a waste of time to frequent, but, while he should have freedom to hold and to act up to his own opinion, he would be as wrong to condemn people that like society as the latter would be to taunt him for being a recluse. Human energies have infinite potentialities, and may embrace any or all departments of nature, art, and science; but human life is comparatively short, and the necessity of maintaining body and mind in a fit state for work makes inroads on the short span of life. Idealism consists in doing one's best to find opportunities for work and usefulness, and in making the best use of them when available.

Nature and creation form a combination of forces that operate with or against each other according to the laws that govern their being. Name and frame are merely passing receptacles of the indestructible essence of existence. They cannot be guarded by any amount of care from change, decay, and dissolution. To keep the essence unsullied by evil contact, to impart to it the highest knowledge and the widest culture,

and to enable it to carry to eternity the light of virtue and truth, have been the aim of the good and the great in all ages and climes. Alternate surrender and obstinate resistance cannot control, much less exterminate, evil. A frank recognition of the mixture of contrasts of which life is composed is necessary—contrasts that may be described as anxiety and asceticism, desire and denial, deference and defiance, depression and elation, health and illness, peace and pugnacity, righteousness and rancour, reform and reaction, success and failure, virtue and vacuity—before effective measures can be adopted to control or eradicate the undesirable partner. Satisfaction of appetites and wants, and attainment of comforts and luxuries, have a contrary effect. The heart has to wake up to the awakening signal, gird its best armour, and advance to battle. Any hesitation when the chance of life and glory lies in quick decision and courage seals the doom of battle. The strength of the reactionary enemy or human progress centres in his absence of hesitation, in knowing his own mind, and in his dogged resistance to reform. When the reformer is equally resolute, then alone can come the tug of war that will decide whether man is to remain brutal or to rise to be divine.

The stages through which individual and national life has to pass to attain bliss may be thus classified. It may be possible to combine more than one of the stages at a time, but too great a hurry in the gradual process of evolution or the omission of any stage retards development.

1. Prevention of physical weakness and ailments.
2. Prevention of mental worry.
3. Removal of any cause of suffering and annoyance.
4. Physical culture and development.
5. Mental and moral discipline ; control of the passions and weaknesses of nature.
6. Culture of the faculties of virility and virtue.
7. Avoidance of evil company and association.
8. Adoption of every available measure or step according to opportunity to diminish the sway of evil.

National happiness is achieved, first, by entrusting the most cultured, progressive, virtuous, and the least prejudiced minds of the time to guide national destinies; and, secondly, by a resolute and steady diffusion of the stages (as set forth) of knowledge, discipline, and culture. Control of anger but nursing of resentment against wrong and injustice, patience, good sense, kindness, frankness, faithfulness, and grim earnestness—these are the virile qualities that every man and woman must attain in order to advance along the road to lasting bliss.

GREAT BRITAIN

CHAPTER III

GREAT BRITAIN

GREAT BRITAIN is at the present day the heart and vivifying centre of the greatest Empire and the largest agglomeration of human beings, sheltered under one banner, that the world has yet seen. Like a mighty constellation shedding light on all mankind, it has been the instrument of teaching a very considerable portion of the human race its language, its love of liberty combined with order and rational progress, and its respect for authority. Four hundred millions of Britons inhabiting different parts of the globe own allegiance to one Sovereign as the living embodiment of the unity of the State, inherit the same traditions of freedom and justice, are governed by the same laws, and aspire to make the State of which they are citizens the model for mankind and for posterity. The name of Britain, its culture, its genius, and its principles of government, which have made it strong and great, are dear and precious to every Briton, and ought to be so to all well-wishers of mankind.

The unique and envied position of Britain is due not merely to the strip of silvery sea which, with a powerful Navy absolutely necessary for security, makes it immune from foreign invasions, but also to the political conditions developed by the wisdom of a host of great minds for successive generations. In India the Viceroy rules, but he is controlled by the Secretary of State in London. The latter is controlled by the Cabinet, the Cabinet is controlled by Parliament, Parliament by the people,

and all are under the influence of the Crown, which again is, like the Aryan conception of Godhead, in everything and makes every department of the State act and live, but is mixed up with none, while its existence depends upon popular support. In Great Britain the Prime Minister takes the place of the Viceroy and Secretary of State, and has, in addition to the other controlling forces, the party he leads to consult. The system of control is in a manner analogous to the laws that govern the forces of Nature ; and so long as each force discharges its functions without fear and without personal ambitions, the British State will remain a marvel among human institutions, and will possess the stability and usefulness of Nature herself. It will be difficult to conceive political institutions in which so little opportunity is afforded to any single estate or authority for the development of self-complacency.

English political institutions, as they have been developed through centuries of struggle, are objects of admiration for thoughtful persons throughout the world, and the model for all nations wishing to secure ordered freedom. Attempts have often been made to imitate them without success, because the conditions that brought them into existence in Britain are wanting elsewhere ; and they continue and are likely to remain unique. It is not an easy matter to set up a monarchical system in which the Sovereign, while representing the unity, strength, and intelligence of a great State, reigns but does not govern, exercises his influence for good on every department of life but does not intervene in controversial matters, feels that the interests of the Throne are intertwined with the progress of the State, and is convinced that both the Throne and the Empire are safe so long as they have monarchs like those of the last three reigns, under whom the State has prospered more than any country can do under the most benevolent despotism. The monarch reigns and does not rule, is above party and politics, is the ultimate arbitrator and umpire in all political differences, shines like the sun impartially on all his subjects

alike, and is thus the recognised and revered emblem of the unity of the State. He engages officers to administer the realm, not according to his own liking, but on the selection of a body elected by the people, whose voice, periodically expressed, entrusts the majority in that body with supreme control over legislation, finance, and administration. Everything is done in his name, but the entire responsibility of government rests with these officers, and not with him. He abides by the advice of his ministers, but the power of dismissing them lies, not with the master of the State, but with the majority of electors, over whom the Sovereign does not exercise any political control. Division of labour and responsibility, avoidance of friction and revolution, maintenance of the continuity of government, and a general balancing of antagonistic forces cannot possibly be better devised. In the eyes of the King all subjects are equal, and their voices have the same weight. Being above differences, he can take an impartial view, and use his legitimate influence on the side of reason. The holder of the crown, as well as his officers, occupies the position that a conscientious person placed in charge of the affairs of another fills—a position in which one can do unlimited good, free from anxiety and worry and indifferent to praise or blame, above suspicion of selfishness and timidity, and restrained from mischief by the possibility of dismissal. The party divisions are also a model for mankind. Each party—one representing rank and wealth and consequently conservative, timid and artful; the other representing the interests of the masses, the advancement of whose welfare is its aim and policy—tries its best to oust the other from power, not by violence, but by holding out inducements to the electors to cast their votes in its favour, accepts the popular verdict without demur, and forgetting the bitterness of strife until the time for another electoral struggle arrives, takes up the patriotic attitude of honestly criticising proposed measures so as to prevent injustice being done to any class. Each party tries to keep the other in order, the one by preventing the car of progress from

going too fast, the other by objecting to its slowness or its stoppage when under the control of the timid party.

While the system of government is the best conceivable, there are anomalies in it, as in every human system and institution, mainly owing to traditions of bygone ages, which it becomes the Herculean task of progressives and idealists to remove. There are people in the ranks of wealth and fashion, and among the classes that benefit by the spending of wealth, who would prefer to be governed by a committee of Peers instead of by the elected representatives of the nation. While this self-regarding attitude continues, and at the same time the number of the rich and well-to-do increases, neither the liberties nor the opportunities of all classes can be considered safe. The influence of the conservative section, especially in England, is far too great to admit of a steady and adequate advance. Nearly half the electors in England—a much less proportion, happily, in the other parts of the United Kingdom—have become indifferent to their own just rights and true interests, are ignorant of their national history, are content to be ruled by a titled oligarchy, and are ready to declare their own unfitness for self-government, professing fear that the family, the monarchy, and the Empire will be in danger if liberal principles are to control the government of the country. Such timidity is also one of the causes that render progressives too impatient for cool progress, such as may not intoxicate the assailants of power and privilege with undue elation: it also necessitates the incorporation in a Liberal administration of men not very different from moderate Conservatives. The struggle for the removal of class distinctions—of inequality in legal privilege, of political disabilities, and of financial injustice, all due to the remnants of feudal power—and for fair opportunity for all citizens to lead a healthy and happy life, has been going on for centuries, is not yet over, and will for a long time have to be carried on against the lingering or retrogressive forces of reaction. Those forces, after strenuous but

unsuccessful opposition, have at last acquiesced in the establishment and expansion of free peoples in distant parts of the Empire, but they have centred all their strength, where their class interests are more immediately concerned, in resisting the development of an England in which the privileged orders will have voice only according to their numbers. A community of free peoples of all classes, creeds, sections, and races, in different stages of development but bound together by common interests, free social intercourse, and equal opportunities—such is the ideal for which progressives strong in enthusiasm have to continue to fight against the ranks whose strength lies in social prestige reinforced by financial resources.

While aristocracies and oligarchies, unless demoralised by wealth and luxury, have always been pugnacious to foreigners, democracies at the present day appear more anxious to fight with their own privileged countrymen for their civil rights and to assert their own importance than disposed to engage in quarrels with other peoples. The coal strike of March, 1912, proved how much the fabric of society rests on the shoulders of labour, and it has opened the eyes of labourers in every trade to the power in their hands. Strikes, class hatred, and other internal troubles, may proceed so far as to weaken a State more than a foreign war, which, if the people have not lost their virility, generally unites them in presenting a solid front to the enemy. The system of government in Britain appears to be best suited to uphold national interests if the balance of power between aristocracy and democracy could be rightly adjusted, as the Liberal Government is trying to adjust it, so as not to permit either to be tyrannical, and to make each realise its dependence upon the other to the extent needed in the interests of their common country.

Although the smallest of the Great Powers in point of compact home territory, Britain is at the present time the most powerful force in human affairs. Her predominant position as a World Empire and as an influence in every department of

life proves how moral, and not physical, strength contributes and sustains greatness and usefulness among mankind. The moral strength of Britain is in no matter better displayed than in setting up the colonies as practically independent States, and in allowing each portion of the Empire as it attains manhood to manage its own domestic affairs. So long as such independence does not rouse a separatist or selfish tendency, it permits each community free development along its own lines, while avoiding causes of friction, which too much centralisation and control invariably produce and thus undermine the fine sense of relationship.

Political institutions form the basis of the greatness of nations, as character and culture constitute the basis of individual worth. England possesses the best institutions conceivable. The question of the franchise is progressing, but it has yet to be settled. Until all are equally fit intellectually, a franchise that gives the vote to eligible men and women in all classes seems the plan more suited to advance national welfare. In addition, England has been enabled by timely changes in those institutions to maintain their usefulness, and to furnish evidence of the character of those that reared them, so as to make it materially the strongest and wealthiest of States. The strength of France lies in thrift; the strength of Germany lies in technical education. England surpasses all in originality of conception and boldness of enterprise. Its advantage over other States consists in the enjoyment of liberties that preclude alike the need and the possibility of revolutions, and of a strong Navy, which guards its shores from possible invasion. Safe from danger within and without, its manhood is free to devote its virility to the attainment of all that is prized in life.

In all neutral foreign markets, and even in some adverse markets, British manufactures are proved by statistics to be well able to hold their own. Not only at the present time, but also in the future, there is no risk of Britain's losing her

hold of the markets, or of ceasing to be the workshop of the world, so long as British manufactures retain their superiority in quality and reasonableness in price, and so long as the prices of raw material, food, and other necessities of life are not raised by protection, or by other artificial methods that make the life of the toiler harder and his brain less active and subtle. Protection and monopoly have in other countries raised a class of plutocrats, but have not made life easier for the worker. Whether plutocracy is beneficial or not, Britain has passed the stage when a small privileged, titled, and wealthy class is needed for show to stand round the Throne and to profess to fight the battles of the people. What Britain now needs is competence more evenly distributed in order to enable every citizen to have enough food, decent clothes, a healthy home, and a happy life. These are necessary not only for themselves as desirable objects, but also to afford every citizen the opportunity of devoting his energies to the attainment of the best education and reasonable culture. Animosity and hatred based on a disparity in the conditions of life may for a time be pleasant for the privileged and galling for the unprivileged, but they are bound to induce a sense of separation. Disunion of hearts when not accompanied by complete physical aloofness hurts the feelings of the suffering class, and also injures the privileged section by impeding its culture and development through connivance at the perpetration of moral wrong. At present England, although the richest country in the world, has the most unequal distribution of wealth. Of every thousand persons the proportion that at death leave more than £100 in England is 186, or half of what it is in France. British patriots and progressives, therefore, have not only to guard the citadel of freedom from assault, which with the revival of reaction is sure to be attempted, but for its security to do all that is possible to provide a minimum standard of life and work for all effective members of the community, and humane and educative conditions for the defective members. So long as a

single defective member exists—defective in physique, in morals, or in education—the ideal stage of happiness and unity cannot be attained.

It is difficult to comprehend the motives that govern human conduct when it is based upon selfishness or upon some principle not broad and clear. Politicians and journalists of the reactionary school, who express anxiety for the greatness and usefulness of their country and government, and do their utmost to propagate the belief that conservatism or absence of progress can alone maintain the strength of England, are always advocating the cause of oppressed classes under reactionary governments in foreign countries and condemning repressive measures of these governments intended to control ideas of reform. If the motive of this inconsistent procedure be jealousy of powerful military despotisms that may become rivals of the British Power, it may be excusable as a patriotic impulse. The cause may more likely be traced to the instincts with which British history and traditions have endowed every one born or bred in Britain, and which naturally lead one to be sympathetic to nationalities carrying on the struggle for freedom that Britain at one time carried through with such success. In this matter the reactionaries prove their British blood and breeding ; but in their advocacy of reaction at home and in other parts of the Empire under direct British control they are obliged to subordinate their instincts to the selfish desire for monopoly and privilege, which distinguishes the class that the reactionaries represent or of which they constitute themselves the spokesmen at home.

Ideas of chivalry and heroism have always consisted in siding with the weak and fighting against the strong, or, when the weak side has not strict justice and right in its favour, in seeing that the fight is conducted on equal terms. When, however, selfish interests, or the interests of those that are regarded as portions of self, come to the front, chivalry, honour, and heroism seem to vanish. So long as the domi-

nation of self pervades the reactionary class alone, the evils it causes are minimised and must sooner or later succumb to the forces of light and knowledge. None of it should be permitted to lurk under any garb in the progressive camp, for then there is a drag that prevents the car of progress and human happiness from advancing with the confidence and enthusiasm that should inspire armies marching to sure victory, unless they are prepared at times to receive a check.

Parties in England have for a long period been divided under various names into progressive and conservative, one advocating progress at a quicker or a slower rate, the other steadily resisting it in favour of privilege. As Liberalism advanced towards the welfare of the masses, and in advocating such welfare attacked vested interests, many progressives whose timidity or moderation was stronger than principle fell away and passed over to the opposite camp. The moderate progressives that went to swell the reactionary force deemed it politic not to renounce their faith in progress for fear of losing support in the country, and began to masquerade as Liberals while advocating the reactionary policy. The Conservatives, in order to make them a part of themselves as well as to propitiate the democracy, renounced their old name of Tory as opposed to the interests of the people, and adopted the names of Unionists, Tariff Reformers, and Imperialists. There has now set in a tendency to renunciation of all old names and policies, and parties are likely in the future to be divided into Imperial and National, the first resisting all progress in the interests of the down-trodden masses at home or in distant parts of the Empire, and advocating domination of class or race as the only means of acquiring or retaining prominence and power, the second appealing to all the virile instincts of all sections and races at home and in all parts of the Empire, and securing the support of all that are opposed to privilege and in favour of equality of opportunity for all British citizens. The first thinks that the greatness of England has been built on

and can be retained by inequality ; the second believes that, whatever it may have been built on under different conditions, the attempt to continue inequality and injustice will surely lead to disaster. The first relies on force as the chief instrument in the government of men ; the second trusts to affection and interest as more potent factors.

In spite of patent facts conclusively proving the correctness of the latter, those that are morally blind cannot be convinced of their folly. "Resolute government" failed to coerce Ireland, which has now been conciliated by the promise of Home Rule—that is to say, the administration of exclusively Irish affairs by the Irish themselves. India has been to some extent pacified by reforms and promise of progress according to development and by the great stroke of statesmanship which led the Sovereigns personally to announce their coronation to the people of India, and thus to recognise the position that India holds in the union of States called the British Empire ; the Colonies have been conciliated by grant of self-government ; the masses at home have been made happier by social reforms tending to raise the standard of life and independence of the labouring population. Under Liberal rule the condition of the classes of public servants with whom the public has most to deal, such as policemen and postal employés, has changed for the better ; and with the improvement in their position, pay, and leisure there has come an improvement in their manners towards the general public. Rudeness or stiffness being one of the attributes of Imperialism, the advance of Nationalism is sure to introduce into the public service greater consideration for fellow-citizens, who with less imperious and bureaucratic treatment would feel as much interest as the officials in advancing the welfare of the community. When the first Reform Bill was passed, a noble peer is reported to have lamented that "now is the sun of England's glory set for ever." If he were to come to life, he would be surprised to find that several more Reform Bills have been passed, and that

England's glory is nevertheless far greater than ever he could have conceived possible. The noble prophet's party now says that in spite of reforms Britain is in the zenith of her power and prosperity. The Nationalist party points out that national Britons know no zenith that implies a later decline, and holds that Britain will, in spite of the Imperialist, continue to advance higher and higher until national British principles govern mankind. The unity and strength of nationalism based on co-ordination and co-operation is incomprehensible to the imperialist mind, which discerns efficacy in no other mode of action than through measures of coercion and separation.

Liberals are sometimes taunted as "Little-Englanders" by their opponents and others that have a notion that expansion of Empire brings greater prosperity. The objection of Liberals to expansion does not proceed from a disinclination to extend the influence of Britain, but from a conviction based on actuality that extensions of Empire become the nursery of reactionary ideas. If there could be a certainty that with the extension of physical dominion the British principles of freedom with responsibility, fair play, justice, and right would remain intact, no Liberal would object even to indefinite expansion. Empire becomes a questionable gain if it undermines the moral sense of the nation. When their countrymen act in a way that brings disgrace on the British name, Conservatives, whether politicians or professors or private individuals, deem it patriotic to deny or to ignore or to gloss over the act. This attitude may catch a spurious popularity, but it does not improve the moral atmosphere of the nation or even render the imperial party itself safe from attack.

The aristocracy, which has been the backbone of conservatism, and which in olden times knew how to be imperial without ceasing to be English, has evidently been getting poorer in intellect and resourcefulness, otherwise it would not have turned for guidance and leadership to ex-governors of

despotically ruled portions of the Empire, who naturally think that constitutional methods or consideration for the wishes and interests of the masses cannot be consistent with the welfare of the State, of which they consider themselves the pivots. It need not be doubted that these estimable men, who by family or social connection have obtained the opportunity of serving the State, are sincere in their belief that without them and their relations and friends the interests of the State will suffer. Such a claim, however, is antagonistic to the permanent well-being of the body politic, which requires for adequate administration the best intelligence of the nation, and not merely the chance intelligence of individuals of a very limited section. The ability to discharge the duties of public offices is not confined to any particular class or classes ; so far as equal opportunity for all, in whatever condition born, is withheld public interests become the monopoly of a small class, or of a certain number of families, who come to look upon themselves as a privileged body specially endowed by Providence to rule their fellow-men. Such a system is manifestly rotten. Democracy in Britain, however, has advanced far enough to prevent the open assertion of such pretensions, and the "natural leaders of the people" are placed in the peculiar predicament of having at one time to secure votes by flattering the masses with praise of their imperial instincts and virtues, and at another to declare their unfitness to control legislation and finance because they own no land, pay no direct taxes, and are consequently not interested in the welfare of their country. This hypocrisy has done more harm to the Imperial party than the advance of democracy, which itself even now shows at times a disposition to rely on aristocratic leadership if it can be unselfish. The Imperial party is thus placed in the anomalous position of having by the law and constitution to submit to the suffrages of the democracy while its existence is based on the principle of aristocratic rule.

To secure votes by deception, the party whose principles are

anything but to secure unity among the different sections of the people, calls itself Unionist. Its unionism is based on the domination of one class over another, or of one part of the Empire over another part. Except in the case of the Colonies, whose emancipation the self-styled Unionists resisted, but failed to prevent, they cannot conceive the likelihood of making the Empire strong and durable by strengthening every link in the chain and fastening it to the heart by bonds of affection and interest. In attempting to be Imperial and Unionist they have, when in Opposition, to advocate measures—such as the Referendum—far more democratic and revolutionary than progressives have ever thought of, and when by such advocacy office is achieved their aim is to cripple the people and extend aristocratic power.

Under the existing constitution the Peers possess supreme jurisdiction in the administration of justice, counterbalancing the possession by the Commons of sole jurisdiction in financial matters. The degeneracy of the British aristocracy is indicated by its foolish attempt to usurp authority over the representatives of the people in finance as well as in legislation, and also by the language in which some of its members openly indulge. High breeding has hitherto consisted in consideration for other people, and in abstaining from a display of manners associated with uncouth environment. Now, however, with indulgence of barbarian methods in warfare outside Europe, and with the importation of Colonial ideas into Britain, it is evidently considered not improper for aristocrats to imitate manners that their ancestors deemed rough. No other explanation seems possible when members of the aristocracy use towards their Liberal countrymen such language as “ragged tatterdemalions,” “piratical crew,” “pests to be stamped out,” “all who assumed office under a Liberal Government were liars pure and simple,” and call a Liberal minister of the Crown, even with the bluest and most heroic blood in his veins, who has in the field of legislation, administration, and statesmanship shed

on the name he bears as much lustre as any of his ancestors in war, "an Anglo-American adventurer." This is the result of the spirit of "damn the consequences," which has damned beyond remedy the peers themselves.

The offensive language used by aristocrats towards progressives appears to be to some extent due to—at any rate it is in consonance with—the indulgence generally extended towards insulting epithets applied to "natives" by persons representing Britain in distant parts of the Empire. Egyptian nationalists are called by the British Commissioner "miserable wretches." Indian patriots are called by their rulers "anarchists and seditionists"; the Irish nationalists are called "disloyal" and "enemies of England." No one in authority or in the press resents this sort of vulgar abuse, which has never done any good to the oppressor and has always strengthened resistance to oppression; and, if for that end people by silence connive at or instigate attacks on Egyptian, Indian, and European British progressives, such silence, however politic, does not advance the spirit of sympathy and unity.

While the aristocracy or upper class by its selfishness and conceit is bringing about its own ruin, retaliatory attacks are to be deprecated. There are no doubt worthless and useless members among the aristocracy as among the democracy, but, while such worthless aristocrats injure themselves more than such of their associates as have breeding and culture to avoid infection, worthlessness among the democracy is more contagious owing to the uncultivated soil where it appears and thrives. The aristocracy in Britain has in the past rendered conspicuous service to the country, and not the least when it sided with the people to curb the powers of despotic monarchs. At the present day, owing to the popularity of imperialism, the "upper class" naturally thinks that the people who wish to be imperial to other races would be pleased to have an imperial or privileged order in their own country, and that they have become so pugnacious as to need aristocratic support. A great deal of

gratuitous service is rendered by the "upper class" to the community, and the very fact that it still continues as a powerful class while such a class in other countries has lost its position and prestige, is evidence of its greater sense of duty. Its antagonism to the people is now caused as much by popular attacks on it as by the natural instinct of self-preservation. To retain the usefulness of every class as well as to prevent a war of classes, neither the Lords nor the Commons should have a monopoly of legislative power. The powers of the two orders should be brought into some relation with their respective values as representative bodies; but, when the country returns a Liberal majority and thus intimates its demand for progressive legislation, the passing of such legislation should be assured. The Parliament Act will effect this object, with the possible intervention of some little delay. But more is needed: a reform of the second chamber, so as to make it an impartial revising yet representative body would be the best solution—if there could be devised such a scheme as would operate with the desired results.

Britain's prosperity is due to the proper balancing of the various social forces, and to the dutifulness of the various classes. Some assert that, because Britain has hitherto been successful with such and such institutions or under such and such conditions, therefore those conditions and institutions should be continued. They might with as much justice say that, because the Armada was destroyed or Trafalgar was won by a certain type of vessel, therefore the Navy should consist of that type alone. Time and circumstance alter conditions, and it is only such as note the change and act accordingly that remain in the van of progress; all the others fall behind. The advance in German efficiency in the arts of war and peace is due, not to superiority of race or character, but to the keen-sightedness of the leaders, which, combined with a disregard of tradition and with timely introduction of change found desirable by experience and trial, has brought the German nation to the front rank of mankind.

Britain includes all the dominions that own allegiance to the Crown. Separatists or imperialists use the word as suits their purpose, including or discarding one part or another according to their sympathies or prejudices. Each part may deem itself the most important, and so long as it does or says nothing to cause disunion, it may be left to flatter itself with the fancy. If every part were to follow the Colonial example of attempting to assert its own superior or exclusive relationship to the Motherland, the result would be the introduction of political and commercial separatism, like the social separatism of the Hindu caste system. Patriotism and true imperialism should consider one part of the Empire as good as another part, and hold it to be the duty of the State to secure and uphold the happiness, honour, and life of every British subject, wherever born or bred.

British womankind, which is asserting its claim to equal rights of citizenship, is distinguished by various characteristics, physical and mental. Although there are many among the sex that are scarcely distinguishable from their Continental sisters, English women have generally a more intellectual type of countenance, while on the Continent they look more flabby and frail. They are less prone to waste time and thought on sentimental whispers of tenderness, and, although not indisposed to a sort of flirtation, are generally businesslike and well able to take care of themselves. Their advancement within the last twenty-five years has been marvellous. Failing opportunities of making good wives and mothers, they are quite capable of helping their fathers and brothers in every department of serious business in life. It would be a pity to make women the rivals and not the partners and helpmates of men, but if partnership is denied there is no other course than rivalry.

In England the number of reactionaries favouring privilege and differential treatment is increasing every year with the increase of wealth, and with their success in persuading certain of the middle and humbler classes to deem it unfashionable, if

not revolutionary, to advocate reform. When reactionaries for the sake of popularity propose or accept changes, they cease to be revolutionary, because acceptance by reaction and timidity is a sign of their being in the way of reasonable progress and development. When, however, similar changes are initiated by the progressive side, they become dangerous. Even Liberal governments, in order to avoid frightening the people by ardently progressive tendencies, have to be circumspectly reticent in their proposals. As a sign of the times it is notable that, while Tory governments appoint none but Tories to the honorary bench of magistrates, a Liberal administration nominates Tories as well, not merely because people professing Liberal views have too little leisure and culture for the Bench, but because there seems to be an idea, as a correspondent of a London Tory paper expressed it, that "efficiency and respectability are a monopoly of the Tory Party." To hold Liberal opinions is, according to Tories, a disqualification for the judicial bench. Either this feeling or else increased leisure and wealth seem to convert progressives to the reactionary side, with the result that Liberalism and competence are threatened with separation. It is anything but politic to dissociate competence and progress, because social security lies in keeping the two together. Freedom, which is a product of progress, may, when prematurely gained, generate an idea of self-importance, and when accompanied by sufficient financial resources may prompt to do neighbours and friends a good turn, but without such resources and without the needful self-control it may be a source of danger to peaceful citizens. Birth used to be the passport to influence, position, and service to the State. With the revolt of a large number of people against hereditary privilege, wealth is taking the place of birth because its influence is widely felt. Intellectual attainments still lag a long way behind unless they are associated with birth or wealth, or until they succeed in securing recognition for their possessor.

Democracy in England is still in the making, because its history and traditions are aristocratic, and at heart half the population are ardently attached to the pomp and glitter inseparable from an artificial division of classes. The people readily admit the leadership of any one that may be connected by birth or marriage with well-known families that have become prominent owing to their members having had opportunities of serving the State—opportunities denied to humbler men unless they can make themselves indispensable or dangerous to the ruling class. Men of the people that have thus come into prominence have until recently been rare. The example set by a popular politician who, beginning life as a republican, became an ardent progressive ready to sweep away all privilege based on birth, renounced his opinions, deserted his party, and, making a bid for the leadership of his former opponents, startled the country by proposing a policy that boldly appealed to the interests of the rich and powerful class—such an example encourages reaction to hold out tempting baits to dangerous opponents and retards the cause of progress. This politician's desertion weakened the Liberal force for twenty years, and introduced during the long Tory domination evils that will scarcely be remedied by a generation of earnest Liberal government. The electors in Britain are still so simple-minded and open to deception that, if a policy injurious to their interests has to be made acceptable, its advocates have only to be eloquent about their anxiety for the people's welfare and to declare that it will bring more money into their pockets. The desire to conciliate Colonials, who have hitherto shown little consideration for British trade and other interests, is a peculiar phase of the new Imperialism. People that can be conciliated only by continuous concessions and sacrifices do not long remain conciliated. Some of them have already revolted against the position and appellation of Colonies, and, if they were strong enough to resist foreign aggression, would soon declare their independence of Britain.

The recent objection of some of the colonies to being called Colonies has been admitted by the Government at home, as generally happens when Colonials make a demand, although there has been some difficulty in devising a suitable description for them in official documents. Desirable as is the expansion of the Empire, so as to find an outlet for superfluous population and products, yet matters assume a very peculiar complexion when the tail finds itself able to wag the body. The change in the manners of the "gentlemen" of England is attributed to the leaven introduced by retired Anglo-Asiatics; in another generation will be witnessed the full result of the influence which, since the introduction of Birmingham methods, Colonials have begun to exercise on British policy, and whose latest exhibition is the threat to ministers in the House of Commons of "lynching in London." In one matter colonial influence has not yet spread to the heart of the Empire: in some of the colonies sex disqualification for the political vote has been removed. This suggests to an eminent Tory opponent of woman suffrage that "the social ideas of the Colonials are different from ours."

In spite of some anomalies and drawbacks, which are, however, with the good sense and resolution of the people likely to grow less—especially if earnest progressives retain, as at present, the confidence of the nation—Britain has secured the first condition indispensable for welfare and happiness, ideal political institutions. The existence of a large reactionary party, constantly recruited by men retiring home from distant parts of the Empire with a fortune or a pension, cannot do much harm, and may indeed be beneficial, so long as it inspires progressives to put forth all their strength and energy. Reactionaries pose as most anxious for the security of the country, as if other people were not equally anxious for it. Their object is merely to embarrass the Government and to lead to a diversion of resources that might be employed for the advancement of the mass of the people. The British Navy is

strong enough to crush any possible invader that may come over the seas. The Army, although thoroughly efficient, is not perhaps large enough to meet on equal terms on land frontiers foes that can bring into the field enormous masses of men. There is no present need for such a contingency, but should it arise Britain would know how to meet it. British history, moreover, proves that superiority in numbers has never been necessary to secure victory, and induces the conviction that, so long as British character retains its doggedness, virility, and wisdom, a numerical superiority may be dispensed with, especially as it might generate a sense of confidence and complacency that might lead to disaster. True men fight well at odds or when pushed into a corner, and those that cannot so fight do not long maintain their interests against assault. In addition, Britain possesses in financial resources and in numbers a much greater advantage than any other State. Accordingly, when her resources are gradually utilised without causing strain, and her fighting units are steadily brought under training according to circumstances, then, instead of dreading invasion, Britain may well be dreaded by other States that may take up an attitude of antagonism. His Majesty's ministers, so long as they are Liberal, may be trusted to do all that is needed to organise the Empire, to place it in an impregnable position, and, if necessary, to cripple or destroy possible enemies before they become dangerous to its security and progress. There have been times indeed when Tories have rendered similar service to the State, but at present they display a grave lack of intelligence, due probably to their long spell of power and consequent development of self-confidence, which renders them wholly unfit to be the guardians of the national destiny.

Owing to national animosities and rivalries created and nursed by ambition and selfishness, it is necessary to raise a defensive barrier against foreign invasion, encroachment, or conquest. In human history invasions have often taken place out of hatred or greed, frolic or folly, but they have never been,

nor can ever be, successful unless the invaded are divided, or unless some among them play the traitor. Now and then British military or naval secrets have been known to go out of the departments concerned, and such breach of confidence is apt to take place when gold becomes the supreme object of worship and sufficient inducement is held out for its satisfaction. Acts of treachery, however, are much more rare in Britain than abroad ; and, so long as every one charged with responsibility undergoes suitable moral training, so as to establish his fidelity to his Sovereign and his country, and so long as the heads of every department are vigilant, there is very little chance of British secrets being divulged, or of any possible foreign enemy benefiting by their disclosure. Every citizen, although not clothed with office, has a serious responsibility to discharge, and so far as he is ready to subordinate private interests to public duty the State is bound to prosper. Any attempt to intoxicate him by undue ambition or self-importance, or to disturb the balance of his mind and judgment by temptation, is dangerous to the State, and is therefore to be gravely deprecated. His duties and true interests have in every legitimate way to be constantly kept before his mind ; but the policy of holding out to him false hopes, or of rousing his ambition by inciting racial hatred, or of corrupting him by prospects of personal gain, though possibly serving selfish and temporary purposes, is sure to undermine his character and virile instincts.

In the region of foreign affairs British policy has generally been sober, vigilant, and prudent, and has avoided entanglement in Continental wars. Owing to change of circumstances and to a supposed necessity for preserving the balance of power, it has in recent times been deemed politic to enter into certain alliances and understandings. Some people object to alliance with any autocratic or military despotism ; others favour alliance according to their personal sympathies. The British Government, whichever party be in power, may be depended

upon to safeguard the interests of the Empire in the best possible manner, and by such alliances as may be most conducive for the purpose. It should, however, strike the ordinary observer that, when the choice lies between two Powers, each of which is a military despotism, it is wiser statesmanship to side with the Power from which for a generation at least no danger is apprehended than with the Power some of whose prominent personages openly declare their intention to have a tussle with the British Navy and to assail the heart of the Empire. No alliance or understanding can be wholly reliable since the ally will remain an ally only so long as his interests prompt him to do so; nor can he obliterate from his memory how Britain has in the past thwarted his designs when they even remotely assailed British interests, and has sharply criticised his acts when they were directed against the freedom of small nationalities within his sphere or against progressive tendencies among his subjects.

With the ententes made with France and Russia, and with the alliance with Japan, Britain's only rival in the world is Germany. It is to be hoped that a similar entente will be established with that Power whose rivalries may be confined to arts of peace. Such an entente is difficult owing to the impression widely prevailing in Germany that Britain has no right to retain her command of the sea or to claim "the suzerainty of the seaboard all over the world," although it seems to be considered perfectly fair for Germany to try to assert a claim to the hegemony of Europe. An understanding with Germany, as with any other Power, is possible only on the condition of that Power's definitely renouncing all desire for expansion at the expense of British interests.

As it is the elementary duty of every government and of every citizen to secure and foster order, so is national defence the prime need of every State. Provision for such defence against any possible enemy or combination of hostile forces has to be made, and every citizen must feel it an important part of

his public duty to do all he can, financially and physically, to make his proportionate contribution. It is neither just nor patriotic to try to shift one's burden on other shoulders : every one is bound to bear the national burden according to his position and capacity. The present expenditure on armaments is in round figures seventy millions—on the Navy alone forty millions—as against a rival Power's forty and twenty millions respectively. If larger expenditure means increased efficiency, Britain is equal to two, and the British Empire to three, Germanies. There are some "patriots" opposed to the Government who profess to wish for a large increase in the latest type of warships, without thinking whether that type may not be obsolete in a short time and have to be rejected. Their "patriotism" is exploded by their refusal to put their hands in their own pockets to find the money for such additional ships, and by their attempt to shift the cost on fellow-citizens less able to bear it.

While unrighteous ambitions and successful robbery continue to be glorified as heroism, every nation that feels its strength to be superior will indulge in them. Under such circumstances the capacity to defend the State ought to be developed in every citizen. As capacity cannot be developed without discipline, it is necessary to undergo training in order to be a good citizen. Military and naval service, whether it is universal or by conscription or other method of compulsion, may have some drawbacks, but it has become a necessity, not merely for purposes of national defence, but for individual training, discipline, and obedience to superior authority. In Britain, the advance of democracy and the desire of politicians to pamper the people by praise in order to gain their goodwill appear to be developing an undesirable form of independence, which pays no heed to the needs or the rights of others and wishes to monopolise them for one's own self. Before this tendency goes further, a system of discipline and respect for authority should be imparted in private life for the benefit of both the individual and the nation.

The development of militarism and of national vanity, although unfortunately fomented by some prominent persons and popular journals, need not be feared in Britain so long as the military is under the control of the civil authority, and so long as British statesmen continue their traditional policy of avoiding offence until the State is invaded. If firebrands are kept under control, and if the State continues under the guidance of men that possess not only foresight and sagacity but also the moral strength to abstain from injuring other States, even when such injury can be inflicted with little or no risk, the chief danger of military training disappears, and its advantages become manifest since they contribute to the healthy development of every individual in the State.

History records the birth, growth, and decay of Empires of all sorts, and the causes that created, preserved, and ended them. They all flourished for a time, dazzling their subjects and others by splendour and apparent indestructibility, but they have ultimately gone to decay and ruin. Britain is the latest and the present centre of World Empire. Some other States aspire to become great empires, but they have not yet discovered the secret whereby empires are made. Besides, as matters stand, other great empires can come into being or expand only at the expense of Britain. After all the teaching of history, Britain is not likely to follow in the steps of empires that have ceased to exist. The continuous course of emancipation, which has distinguished British statesmanship, is not likely to be changed, although extension of wealth and luxury may at times threaten to retard progress and to divert British policy from its steady and unique career of enfranchisement. It is evident that the genius for ordered freedom, and for a resolute though sometimes slow advance, exists in the British Empire more than anywhere else, and that Britain is intended by Providence to point the way to a new Imperialism—an Imperialism that will follow the course of nature as regulated by human virility and fair-mindedness, and will make the

British Empire immortal as well as a beacon for mankind. That course is indicated in the human physical system under the control of a well-regulated mind. The heart supplies the blood, which circulates all through the system, coming back to be renewed. Each bone, limb, muscle, sinew, and vein is a necessary part, the importance of each depending upon the nature of the function each has to discharge. All are interdependent, and none can be separated without affecting the fullness and crippling the vitality of the whole man. In a rebellious mood, some single member, thinking itself the most important part of the system, might attempt a revolt which, if not speedily checked by the joint action of mind and heart, might cause decay and disruption. If British policy would always follow the course of nature, permitting every portion of the Empire to enjoy freedom of development and local autonomy, and to receive the needful help and vitality from the heart, while enjoining undeviating loyalty to the whole by a due discharge of the functions with which it may be entrusted, there is no reason why Britain should not continue, for so long as human vision extends, to be the latest and greatest of Empire States, and to teach mankind how great States should be formed and sustained. In the growth and welfare of Britain, all Britons—whether European, Asian, African, or American—are interested, because unless the heart is kept sound vitality cannot be communicated to the limbs. All would feel equal pride in being British, if only reactionaries would cease to speak of Britain as composed of one race, class, or creed, and would recognise that all have according to their several capacity contributed to its growth and development.

Empire is a misnomer for British dominions each of which enjoys practical independence of the central Government, can pass what laws it likes without fear of veto, imposes at its will and pleasure duties on British manufactures, and is not obliged even to pay for its own defence or to share in the defence of the whole. The term Empire is strictly applicable only to the

connection of Britain and India ; and in this case, owing to prejudices created by successful detractors and reactionaries, the Empire is referred to with bated breath as a thing more calculated to cause shame than to excite pride. A noble peer once described the fox-hunting spirit to be the bulwark of the Empire. If so, he and his order should patriotically see to it that foxes in any shape are hunted down for its security. There is nothing in a name : what is of consequence for the British State is that British principles shall be maintained in its government. All independent Asiatic countries are adopting liberal institutions. Any portion of the British Empire cannot lag behind without being the butt of ridicule of all Asia.

The disruptionists that would fain see and even instigate the perpetuation of a bellicose spirit between man and man, between class and class, and between race and race, have been compelled by circumstances to change the scope of their propaganda because they find it unprofitable. Their vision of enforced unity has now extended to the Continent of Europe, and they speak of Europeans, or (when non-Europeans are included) the "White" man, as forming one group with identical interests and common aims, because they happen to be born within certain degrees of latitude and longitude and possess something in common with men that have rendered great services to their country or to mankind. Apart from historical traditions, religious and lingual differences, and political aims, the character of the Briton, as displayed in the face of danger and disaster, is quite the opposite of the character of the Continental European. In wars among Continental Powers the greatest stress is laid on striking the first effective blow, because an initial disaster demoralises a force and undermines its fighting qualities. A Continental army has not the virility and doggedness necessary to retrieve first defeats. Among Britons victory or disaster at the commencement makes no difference to the national resolution not to be elated or daunted until the thing is seen through to the end.

Taxation is essential for the work of government, and people have to contribute for the maintenance of peace and order. It is, however, proper that the classes that benefit most by such peace and order, and that are by fortunate circumstances able to bear the greatest burden with the least difficulty, should contribute the most, or according to capacity to bear it. While this is right as a general principle, it is not an easy matter to decide who is best able to bear the heaviest taxation. It is generally admitted that taxation of luxuries and superfluities causes the least inconvenience, and these ought to bear the first and the heaviest brunt. Then there are articles—such as liquor and tobacco—that are not only luxuries, but luxuries positively injurious to those that use them and a source of inconvenience to those that do not use them and have to associate with people addicted to them. Such articles cannot be too highly taxed, until their use can be restricted to medicinal purposes.

The income tax is a legitimate source of revenue, and it falls, as Liberal Chancellors have regulated it, according to capacity to bear the burden. There is, however, one element of weakness in its calculation. The same money passing as income through various hands is added up as if each item were a separate and distinct sum. The income of a wealthy person, on which he pays tax, is spent on necessities and luxuries and goes to the pockets of the purveyors. These latter, again, pay tax on what they get as profit from what they sell and spend it in various ways in the purchase of material or labour. The earnings of labour are, in like manner, paid away as rent or as the price of food and clothing, which goes into the pockets of the wealthy landlord or capitalist to be calculated as income to pay tax on. Thus the profits go in a circle, and the tax is borne by the same money several times in its passage from hand to hand. The calculation of the taxable income of the United Kingdom as eighteen hundred millions is therefore as fallacious as would be the calculation of one

estate passing from hand to hand in quick succession and paying a separate duty at each succession as forming several units of the national wealth. The calculation of an average per head is also, under present conditions, misleading. Taxation falls lightly on the few thousands of the well-to-do, and heavily on the struggling tradesmen, clerks, and others earning less than £500 a year. A more just method of imposition and calculation is desirable. It appears to be fair that all that is spent on what may by authority and parliamentary sanction be decided as absolute necessities should be exempted from taxation. Outside that sum, there may be imposed on each individual, according to his position in life, such taxation as may be necessary for the needs of the State. Even on this plan the difficulty of taxing the same money more than once in its passage through different hands cannot be avoided, but as luxuries diminish the taxable income becomes proportionately less and has to bear a larger percentage.

There may be a difference of opinion as to what are absolute necessities and what should be regarded as luxuries. Even in the matter of ordinary food and drink, medical opinion, as well as lay opinion, is divided as to the quantity and quality needed to preserve the health and soundness of the body and its faculties. Luxuries often by habit become necessities. Whatever difference of opinion or of taste may exist, it should not be difficult for purposes of taxation to fix a standard necessary for persons in ordinary health, with a certain allowance for illness. Beyond that standard everything should be treated as luxury, and the amount spent on its indulgence should be taxed accordingly.

In the matter of national wealth a wider distribution of financial resources by means of variegated industries and by production of the needs of comfortable living is the way to secure national well-being; but the accumulation of large fortunes in a few hands while the mass of workers are hardly able to secure a living wage is not the way to make a nation

prosperous or wealthy. What already exists in the country may be regarded as capital, and what annually comes from abroad in the shape of food, raw material, manufactures, precious metals and jewels should be rightly considered as additions to national wealth.

The safety of the State and happy progressive development being assured by geographical and human conditions, Britain is placed in the enviable position denied to Continental States of trying experiments in popular government, of utilising the brains and faculties of all classes of its citizens, and of being able to devote attention to the great social problems of existence. In States, as in individual life, constant watchfulness and resourcefulness in solving the questions that crop up from time to time can alone keep in check the seed of decay and secure healthy progress. Those questions can be solved only by leaders that are interested in the advancement of all classes of the nation, and that do not consider that, so long as a few are well off and a sufficient number can be trusted to be their henchmen, everything is all right. It is the triumph of this spirit of contentment, combined with a long peace, that has always caused decay and disaster. A warlike spirit has to be fostered so long as other States are armed to the teeth, and that spirit cannot develop militarism so long as a sincere progressive spirit also rules the Empire.

The dangers and hindrances that threaten progress in Britain are all social, and it is on that account a most encouraging sign that ministers who have placed in the forefront of their policy grand projects of social reform should have at three consecutive appeals to the people received their support. To enable every class and every individual to command moral and physical health, suitable education, work, a happy home, medical treatment in illness, and absence of want in old age—this is statesmanship. Those conditions alone can extirpate misery, the evils of alcoholic propensities, and disposition to crime. When it is considered that it is the interest

of a large number of capitalists to demoralise their countrymen by drink, that three hundred millions of money are invested and two million adults are engaged in the manufacture and distribution of the most injurious of human beverages, it is surprising that the country still prospers, and that the numbers addicted to crime do not greatly increase. A certain type of mind would doubtless say that England's greatness is reared on freedom to drink liquor, as on inequality. It is no use arguing with such a type, but sober and sensible persons have to see that the conditions of the people are such as to continue greatness and usefulness, whatever may be deemed by some to have been the means by which they have been achieved. The consumption of liquor is not, as is generally believed, confined to the humbler and toiling classes. These classes perhaps display their intoxication more than others, but the bad effects of drink are felt more by the classes that use their brain than by the classes that live by their muscles. An eminent London physician is reported to have recently stated that secret drinking among the upper and middle classes is far more common than is generally known. The consumption of spirits and of other intoxicating liquors—even of eau-de-Cologne—is said to be painfully large. In the industrial centres women drink more than ever; and in the public-houses of some of the great cities of the kingdom women, and even quite young girls, are found to frequent the bars. The effects of drinking on women are, as may easily be guessed, loss of will-power and of self-control, weakening of the nervous system, and development of impulsiveness. Figures, however, prove that the sale of liquor is decreasing, and that the revenue from it is falling off. If there is a steady and perceptible decline in consumption, it is a hopeful sign; but patriots should not rest until the liquor traffic, like the sale of poison, is controlled, if it cannot, like the publication of pernicious literature and the "slave" traffic, be suppressed altogether.

Anxiety is at times expressed by pessimists because the population of the country is not increasing at the same rate as of old, and because there is a large emigration to the colonies. It is a good thing for the colonies to be able to attract so much of British virility, and for England to have possessions where the superfluous population may be quartered; but the old country cannot lose much by such emigration, especially when the death-rate is growing less owing to healthier environments. Land and production are limited at home, whereas in the colonies there is unlimited scope for development. The colonies possess enormous tracts of unpeopled territory with fertile soil, rich forests, and mineral land, and so long as those only leave that cannot do well at home and are likely to find better opportunities abroad the Motherland cannot suffer loss. There is a tendency also, with quicker means of transit, for successful individuals to come back and settle down in the old country, where they find better conditions of life.

Diminution in the rate of increase of population is not at all necessarily race suicide, as it is sometimes called. The strength of a race is increased by a diminution of improvident marriages and of unhealthy offspring that parents do not bring up properly, and by saner conditions, which, while deterring people from undertaking the serious responsibilities of a family, enable them to enjoy sound health and to prolong life. Owing also to increasing cost of living and difficulty of earning larger incomes, there is a disposition to avoid matrimony, and, when matrimony is unavoidable, to restrict the birth of children. In this, as in other social problems, the law of nature is taking its course. Avoidance of matrimony and restriction of children are due not, as some think, to a selfish desire to evade duties which, although onerous at times, are not unpleasant, but rather to a greater sense of responsibility, which is increasing along with more advanced ideas of life, and which deems it wrong to seek personal happiness at the

risk of misery to progeny and future generations. Deliberate abstention from the blessings of family life and from enjoyment of the happiness of rearing children is a proof of self-sacrifice, if it does not lead to enervating personal pleasures. It is also advantageous for the State, for whose welfare it is far more desirable to have fewer children suitably brought up than a numerous offspring ill-reared. Since the introduction of death duties the interest of Chancellors of the Exchequer lies in quicker deaths of the well-to-do, but the interest of individuals lies in prolonging life; and the best way to prolong a healthy life is to observe continence and to avoid worry. Even with a diminution in the ratio the population of England is increasing at the rate of about a thousand a day, and the increase can be absorbed only with expansion of industries. Through the exertions of efficient local authorities the ratio of deaths has in a generation gone down by nearly one-half. This proves how illness, suffering, and premature decay may be controlled by care, foresight, and wisdom. Patriotic rulers have to go a step further and to regulate affairs so that the increase of population may be on the basis of quality and not of quantity, and that the coming race may surpass their fathers in physical, moral, and intellectual endowment.

While the adult population in Britain is much better off than in days of old, infant mortality is still appalling, and how to diminish it is one of the great problems of the day. Apart from inherited characters, the health and the future welfare of children depend upon the nursing they receive in infancy, the care bestowed upon them as they grow up, and the training given them. Mothers are the best nurses for children, but mothers that have to work to maintain themselves and their family have no time to attend to children, and have to leave them to Fate or Providence. Mothers that are well off leave the care of their children to others, and only in those cases where children are lucky enough to get good and dutiful

mothers and guardians is a chance of proper development afforded. Worries arising from financial stress, want of leisure, or indifferent health, and perversities of social convention, tell against the care of children. Careful and dutiful nursing by strangers is becoming more difficult to secure. Nurses, when available, themselves exact more care and attention than they are prepared to bestow on their helpless charges. Not only so, but with the growth of "independence," it is not unusual to find them in parks and other public places shamelessly ill-treating the little mites either through temper or through neglect for purposes of flirtation. Under the circumstances, unless culture and statesmanship can devise the means of bringing up a healthier and manlier generation, infant suffering and mortality cannot be avoided, except by abstention from matrimony on the part of those that are from any cause unable to rear their children satisfactorily. Recruits for the army and navy are not enrolled without a certificate of fitness. National duty has to extend to the acquisition of a sense of fitness before couples marry or add to the numbers of the nation.

In connection with matrimony and nursing the whole problem of domestic arrangements is becoming acute. While people are being made more helpless by wealth and luxury, they are unable, or find it more difficult, to secure dutiful service from strangers. The servant problem is the problem of inducing the class that depends for living upon domestic service and manual labour to be dutiful and respectful. While independence is associated with insolence, and happiness with indolence, no suitable solution of the problem is possible. A satisfactory solution must be found if the reputation of British virility is to be maintained, and if all classes are to be saved from the ruin and wretchedness that will be the inevitable consequence of a continuance or further development of the difficulty. A feasible remedy might be to arrange for the importation of Asiatic servants,

who will be pleasant and devoted, at any rate until they imbibe the European spirit of "independence"; but if they were treated in Europe as their employers treat them in Asia and Africa, they could not be long relied upon.

Discontent is, to a certain extent, proof of the advance of a class in education and social condition, and when based on reasonable grounds is laudable, as without it no individual, class, or race can make material or moral progress. Discontent of the labouring class in Britain is largely based on the refusal of capital to share with labour the enormously increasing profits of industries, and to afford to labour healthier and happier conditions with the change and increasing cost in the standard of living. It is also based on the general tendency to ascribe "divinity" to persons of European descent, to encourage them to pose as angels and gods to non-European mortals, and yet to deny to them at home the share of power, prestige, and wealth to which all angels and gods are entitled. Labour becomes unmanageable when capital becomes selfish and ceases to be wise and humane. At the same time order is endangered, and society is threatened with anarchy if the working classes are permitted to combine to put the whole nation to inconvenience and to land themselves in privation and misery. On the Continent the remedy for disorder, riot, and strikes lies in the use of powder and shot. In Britain, fortunately, so far legal prosecution and penalty have been efficacious, but it behoves employers to be wise in time and to take precautions so that Continental example may not infect the British labourer. If it does, the problem of how to grapple with undutiful and impertinent poverty will become serious, and will have to be added to the existing problems connected with lawlessness, license, and liquor.

A most ominous situation is being created by the struggle between Capital and Labour, between wealth and work, between the leisured class and the class that has to earn its

daily bread. The satellites of wealth are the most responsible for the situation. By hypocritical professions of interest in the welfare of the toiling classes, by pandering to their conceit and vanity for the sake of momentary popularity and personal gain, by rousing their "patriotism" against the foreigners while resisting proposals for their social and political amelioration, and by stigmatising those that befriend the toilers against powerful classes as enemies of property and order, the reactionaries have created a conflict of interests, which is bound to grow more and more bitter, and from which any consideration for opponents or even simple fair dealing will soon disappear. The result is already apparent in the weakening of a sense of the sacredness of contracts, in the desire for higher pay and less work, and in the readiness to suffer needless privations in order to put employers to inconvenience. The unwillingness to fulfil contracts of work for wages, to do household work, and to show ordinary courtesy to employers, is regarded as "independence," and as a protest of free men and women against doing menial or hard work. Employers and well-to-do people are placed at a disadvantage by this development, by the absence of a feasible remedy against the caprice of the employed, and by the dreaded necessity of importing foreign labour to cope with the rebellious spirit of the working classes; but, unless wealth and luxury have made them helpless and undermined British strength of character, they will doubtless find a remedy for this wretched state of things. Unless a remedy is found, and people of all classes and grades are impregnated with a sense of duty and mutual respect, anarchy, rebellion, and civil war will be the inevitable consequence, and will bring to an end the greatness of the nation. In some industries disputes between capital and labour appear to be beneficial for the disputants, as the capitalist raises the price of his products and the labourer gets higher wages. The consumer—the public—has to pay for the benefit of both.

As national wealth increases and is more diffused, and the price of necessities of life advances, the labouring classes are justified in resisting the selfishness of capital to grab more than a reasonable share of profit. Strikes by organised labour appear at present to be the only means by which to secure justice. They raise prices for the general community, which, however, with increased competence, ought not to object to share some of it with the poorer classes. If strikers would only abstain from violence, either on non-strikers or on innocent people, and observe the sacredness of contracts, they cannot but have the sympathy of all reasonable men. It should, however, be apparent that, with the increased production of gold and the consequent increase of wealth and luxurious living, as the well-to-do become more and more helpless, Liberalism or progressive government alone will stand between order and revolution. Democracies are bound to get out of control when they find that votes alone are not enough to prevent reaction and privilege from standing in the way of the realisation of their wishes.

Although labour in England, as elsewhere, is exploited for gain, no idea of inhumanity, as in other lands, enters into the question. Where, however, the idea of exploitation, and not of fair exchange, is uppermost, it must lead to some sort of cruelty unless labour is able to take care of itself, or unless laws and judges protect it from abuse. Prudent capitalists are aware of the necessity of keeping labour in good health and humour, and conciliate it to serve their own ends. It is necessary for labour also to understand its own interest, and, while demanding a fair share of the yield of its skill or strength, to remember the interests of the other side as well, without which the demand for labour would not exist. In this as in all other matters of life mutual consideration and a subordination of selfish greed would adjust all difficulties and dissensions. The right policy is to train the capitalist to feel his national responsibility, and

to provide for the worker as much as would make him efficient for his work and at the same time not intoxicate him with an idea of self-importance. It is the duty of the State to remove the obstacles that bar his opportunities for advance in life, and to provide arbitration in case of disputes, with penalties for non-fulfilment of the award by either side.

A consequence of the suicidal attempts made by reactionaries to gain the newly enfranchised working classes to their side by hypocritical professions has been the development of a spurious independence, which means not only bad manners and a disposition to shirk work, but also a love of pleasures and amusements and the practice of manifold deception on employers. If the working classes are really proud of being Englishmen and Englishwomen, and are as patriotic as "imperial" organs describe them, they should take care that their own interests, as well as those of their country, are not endangered by a display of misguided independence. As a result of their attitude, well-to-do people that require domestic servants are more and more employing foreigners in their households. This practice must grow as English servants become more independent, and, while creating national dangers by the presence of foreigners with whose country Britain may have to go to war, will compel the poorer classes either to suffer more want and wretchedness through non-employment or to emigrate to some distant portion of the Empire. It is time that reasoned appeals were made in the public press and by public men to their patriotism, as well as to their individual interests, not in order to catch votes but to guard the interests of the heart of the Empire.

The inextinguishable partnership of evil with good is illustrated in the relationship of the United States with Britain. America is sending to Britain its fair democratic daughters and millions of its dollars to rejoice and to enrich British noblemen; but it also sends more criminals than

any other foreign country. The proportion of American crime to population is increasing. The American genius, with its freedom from tradition, from religious scruples, and from antiquated methods, is peculiarly adapted for devising gruesome crimes that the old ways of the Old World cannot conceive; and, as on account of a common language, whose name the Americans wish to change to "international," habitual criminals as well as dollar princesses find the *entrée* easy, Britain is naturally infected as much with the poison of criminality and with new ideas of violence as enriched by transatlantic gold.

Among the dangers against which Britain has to guard, invasion or foreign conquest is a very distant contingency so long as British character is not undermined by wealth and its attendant evils. Snobbishness has to be kept under check. People with incomes that enable them to meet their wants are eager to pass as richer and belonging to the "upper ten," and many among the poorer middle and labouring classes side with and vote for the party which has always resisted their enfranchisement and which in power never pays the slightest heed to their demands. Others side with the aristocracy because it is the "imperial" party, which, owing to its professions, they consider to be best fitted to guard the interests of their relations and friends in parts of the Empire where the possession of nothing else but the same colour of skin goes a long way to establish one's claim to attention and influence as belonging to the aristocratic or ruling class. Liberal principles are disliked because they interfere with the easy acquisition of wealth at the expense of weaker fellow-creatures by setting up a standard of duty and right which is not palatable to unscrupulous greed. So long as poverty is considered degrading, as it has come to be in the West, those that have not the opportunities for acquiring competence are anxious to assert their importance for the satisfaction of self-love, and they think that the profession of reactionary opinions or the

display of rudeness is, as it used to be in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, a sign of respectability and wealth. For petty and selfish ends this class is prepared to sacrifice their rights as freemen, and to place their necks under the yoke of aristocratic and plutocratic domination.

A wail is now and again heard that English trade is threatened by foreign competition. If it is threatened, a large part of the responsibility may be sought in the changed manners of English tradesmen and shop assistants in their dealings with customers, especially in London—a change for which reactionary politicians and journalists have to be thanked.

“Cæsar's no merchant, to make prize with you
Of things that merchants sold.”

Instead of turning their heads by putting into them an exaggerated sense of their importance, those that wish to be known as patriots should impress upon the trading class the somewhat obvious principle that gentle manners attract customers and rudeness drives them away. Shops and businesses that have polite managers and assistants prosper, while those that have “imperial” employees have to give the latter plenty of time and opportunity for other business than that for which they are employed. If in addition to superiority in quality and reasonable price of goods English tradesmen would retain their traditional though cold politeness, and not imitate American and Colonial manners, English trade need never be afraid of losing ground either abroad or at home.

London, as the Metropolis of the Empire, plays an important part in moulding national destiny. When the majority of metropolitan electors are Liberal, the Empire may expect a progressive régime. As wealth and fashion are naturally centred in the metropolis, the progressives have always to be on the alert to prevent London from relapsing into reaction. London is the Capital not only of the United

Kingdom but also of India, Canada, Australia, of scores of smaller countries, islands, and archipelagos all over the globe. Considering its size and population, its healthiness is marvellous, and proves what effective official initiative can do to secure health and comfort for the people. London is a mass of brick and mortar generally piled up like boxes without art or dignity ; but a stretch of four miles of green park, trees, and foliage like that from Whitehall to Kensington, in addition to other large parks and innumerable small squares, cannot be seen in the heart of any other capital in the world. Like an octopus, London is extending its tentacles. Parts that a few years back were rural walks and country farms are now absorbed in the metropolis, and are as crowded with skyscrapers as the older part. If this process goes on for a few generations, a considerable proportion of England will be included in the metropolis, which will not be an undesirable thing if the solution of the problems of physical health and locomotion keeps pace with the extension.

The attractions of London are not its places of amusement, which are improving every year in gorgeousness of mounting if not in artistic performance, or the facilities afforded everywhere to young couples to proclaim their happiness to all observers, but sanitation, comforts of life, scientific and educational facilities, and, what appears to be yet wanting in provincial towns, a true imperial spirit that makes no distinction of race, nationality, or place of birth, and shows complete toleration of religious differences. There is, however, one matter in which London is behind other great capitals : its museums and art galleries are comparatively poor. In recent years, indeed, a greater impetus has been given to Art ; but either the general dullness of the atmosphere or the anxiety of wealthy individuals to monopolise artistic acquisitions prevents the museums from rivalling those on the Continent. The general appearance, as well as artistic taste, would be improved if all town houses, beginning with Buckingham Palace, could

at frequent intervals receive a simultaneous outside cleaning. London ought to be the intellectual and fine art centre, as it is the counting-house and the political centre, of the Empire. Its educational institutions place London in advance of the older Universities, whose alienation from the national life, in spite of internal reforms and increased activities, is getting more and more marked with the advance of democracy. Although within their precincts many poor students are enabled by charitable endowments to obtain education, they are practically cut off from the common life of the country, and they hold themselves aloof from the institutions that are not for the governing and well-to-do classes. The fortunate few from the lower social strata, instead of continuing in and influencing the ranks from which they spring, go, like Indian students educated in Europe, to swell the ranks of the governing classes. Hence the old universities, like the public schools and the commissioned ranks of the Army, remain alien to the mass of the people of England. There are some seventy-four thousand teachers in the English elementary schools. An absurdly small proportion of these teachers have been taught at the old Universities. In Scotland, on the other hand, the part of Britain where education is, thanks especially to John Knox, universal and universally prized, half the teachers in the elementary schools have been taught at the national Universities; and in three north-eastern counties, where there are special endowments, not a single head-master but is a graduate. Progressives naturally desire that the existing resources of Oxford and Cambridge should be so employed as to make them really national Universities, in which all classes may freely study and associate and take a common pride. Considering the conditions, however, the transformation is not an easy thing to accomplish. The financial difficulty can be met only by the people through the State providing the funds for the growth of their intellectual life.

Though the Metropolis shows many signs of virility and

progress, it is faced by some difficult problems, the solution of which can be compassed only by its active and prolific brains. The appalling mass of destitution and pauperism, which, although diminishing in the rest of the country, tends to increase in the metropolis, is a matter of serious moment, not only for the sufferers but for the moral life of the community. London is said to be losing hold upon the engineering, ship-building, and other high-class trades. Many printing works have been transferred to the country. The reason is that rents are prohibitive, and that, with increased competition and the cost of living added to the rates, it is necessary to pay a higher standard of wages than is customary elsewhere. The question of rates concerns all, although they vary considerably between the poorer and wealthier districts.

The question of housing and overcrowding affects all districts more or less. In some boroughs thirty-seven per cent. of the people live in "homes" of one or two rooms. The question of taxing land or ground value is in process of being solved, but the development of recent legislation will take some time. The creative power of rural land requires the direct and constant application of capital and labour. Urban land requires no such application to maintain or to increase its value, which is due to the existence and the industry of the adjacent population, except in so far as it is added by direct expenditure on the property itself. The leaseholding occupier bears the burdens, and at the end of the lease all the unexhausted benefit is confiscated by the owner. The occupier, then, cannot be expected to spend money on improvements; and if the owner did, the occupier may not be disposed to pay the higher rent the owner would require. The great need of suitable and sanitary housing is urgent, and will have to be provided without overburdening the ratepayer.

The habit of local co-operation for local purposes, the sense of common life and common interests that prevails in other self-governed towns, have been discouraged in London, to the

great disadvantage of London life. Social evils and dangers can be adequately coped with only by a powerful local body possessing a free hand to deal with the land question, the housing question, the trading question, local taxation, water, electricity, gas, and means of locomotion. Wisdom lies in attending to immediate needs, in remedying present evils, and in preparing with a wide and instructed outlook for a brighter and happier future. In spite of its acute problems, inseparable from human institutions, it is amazing how London continues to grow as the healthiest and biggest of world capitals.

The problem of securing national development in England, as in every other country, centres in the question of education. On the right solution of that problem depends not only the material well-being of the masses but also the moral and intellectual growth without which the greatness of a nation cannot be permanent, and failing which the great States of past ages have disappeared. The Liberal Education Act of 1870 by compelling all children to go to school brought about social, political, and economic conditions which are being gradually realised. It has yet to be settled whether the capacity to tackle problems of existence is best acquired by deep learning in one isolated branch, as practised in the older Universities, or by the policy of wide education, as followed in other universities and institutions. Whichever may be found more efficacious, the other need not be wholly given up, and both may flourish side by side. The disposition of a large number of people to seek material luxuries is ominous, but it cannot turn the scale in favour of decay if an equally large number resolutely hold to the path of moral progress. Imperialism and reaction, however dangerous they may have become by undesirable connections, have not yet been able to obstruct progress and to lead to decay because great reforming measures devised by progressive genius have constantly added to the numbers opposed to reaction. Moral and intellectual growth has to be similarly assured by taking it out of the

power of Conservatives and priests to stop it by hesitation to admit desirable change. Diversity in minds, gifts, and endowments, like variety in physical powers and lineaments, has to be noted and considered. In social and religious as well as in educational matters, the example Britain has set in politics—a course that has been Britain's salvation—should be followed in order to escape stagnation and decay. There should be formed in each institution a party whose principle will be freedom and progress, as opposed to the party now monopolising power and directing it to the prevention of change. Such a force has come into being in the sphere of physical science, which has consequently made the most progress in recent years. Other departments of knowledge have to follow the example if their efficiency is to be retained, and if true education, commencing with self-education, is to be imparted to every member of the community. Such education will also be effective in counteracting the growth of self-complacency, which it is the interest and the policy of reaction to foster. Liberal education is the means of securing great leaders. Rhetoric and statesmanship are generally held not to go together. The preparation of fine speeches attractive to the public is deemed incompatible with the hard, quiet, efficient work of a busy administrative mind. Britain, however, has in recent years produced several such geniuses. Germany produced in the last century Bismarck, who succeeded in making his country what it is: France had Gambetta, who saved his country from the imminent risk of reaction and despotism. Impulsive rhetoric may not always be an attribute of great statesmanship, but there are specially gifted brains that can combine any number of even antagonistic qualifications unthinkable for the generality of men.

How self works is observable in the action and attitude of different classes, each class thinking that its members are alone the salt of the earth. Birth and wealth look down with contempt upon those that are less fortunate, while poverty,

which should at any rate be meek, deems it wrong that people should be well off when it is in want, and, in addition, assumes airs of misplaced independence. Independence of the mind, like material competence, has to be fostered in order to develop self-respect; but, if it intoxicates the mind, it does more harm to the assertor than to the party against whom it is directed. A street beggar in London, being "imperial," does not ask for alms in the meek manner of provincials: he behaves as if he had a rightful claim, and, when refused, shows a disposition to knock down and rob if the place is secluded and if the chance of being caught is remote. The person appealed to, on the other hand, if he gives alms at all, does so with such an air of contemptuous superiority as to take away all sense of gratitude. Much the same may be said of every class whether in public or in private life, in authority or in obedience. Even truthfulness ceases to be valued, and is regulated according to sympathies. After the first day's poll at the last General Election it was wired abroad that Consols had fallen because the Tories had not made the gains they expected! It is the consequence of training in an isolated branch of life, which cannot feel or know the wants of other branches with which it has had no communion.

For the same reason even the noble creed of Liberalism or of humanitarianism does not attract all for whose good it works. It fails at times to realise the point of view of antagonists. Liberalism would not make life easier for the poor by attacking the property of the rich, nor would it advance the interests of labour by disregarding the claims of capital. If the labourer can violate his contract when he likes, or when he comes to be too well off, not only will the ranks of labour be thinned, but the class whose competence is attacked will become larger and stronger. No country can prosper without both capital and labour: if either is wanting, it has to be got abroad; and when it is got abroad, the produce and wealth of the country go abroad as well.

Savages are said to have a fondness for lawlessness and turbulence; but there occur at times in the most advanced European countries—not to speak of the doings of Europeans outside Europe—events that prove that the savagery of human nature, which has the same instincts as animals, is only kept under control by circumstances, such as fear or self-interest, and is apt to break out at a favourable opportunity or on a sudden impulse. The doings of European troops in China in 1901 furnish evidence that even discipline and the presence of educated officers cannot control savagery. In Britain itself evidence of savagery is now and again presented. The pelting of Judges with coal at Hull on June 1, 1911; the mobbing of two innocent girls by a crowd in Hyde Park in May, 1911, because somebody shouted that they had “harem” skirts; the outbreak at Longmoor Camp on New Year’s Day, 1912; the ill-treatment of young children, often witnessed in the parks, by their nurses and sometimes by “roughs”; the hooliganism of some medical students of the Birmingham University in February, 1912, to prevent a discussion of the Insurance Act, in spite of the advice of their own Dean to have a fair debate; the strike about the same date of some students of a Training College at York, because three of their comrades had been suspended by the Principal for gross insubordination; the murder of a teacher at Trim, in County Meath, by some of his pupils; the stoning of the Governor of Jamaica and his secretary by strikers; the “ragging” in March, 1912, by students, of a newspaper correspondent at Aberystwith, for adversely criticising their Rugger team; the smashing of windows by Suffragists in March, 1912; the assaults on private individuals for difference of opinion in politics—such incidents indicate the thinness of the veneer of civilisation over the brutal nature. Strikes of workmen and combinations for coercion of individuals and classes, often accompanied by violence, also prove that the selfishness of nature sometimes becomes uncontrollable. When men and women of the better

classes, supposed to possess education and refinement, instigate acts of violence, as was done in Belfast, in January, 1912, it is plain that education and refinement are not always strong enough to keep under control the brute in human nature. Under such circumstances, firmness on the part of authority is necessary: the adoption of prompt and adequate measures for the repression of savagery is indispensable for the safety of the innocent members of the community and of the fabric of society. Any weakness proceeding from a fear of losing votes would encourage anarchy, or even bring about a cessation of popular government.

Democracy does not mean the development of laziness and rudeness, nor is self-government intended to secure the despotism of some over others. Popular government cannot be better than despotism if leaders are more anxious to follow than to guide opinion, if their minds always run in one groove, if suggestions are rejected or disregarded, and if the interests of any section of the community receive consideration at the expense of other sections. In parliamentary government the majority must rule, and the British system of party secures the stability for the administration, along with popular control, which is unknown to other countries. It is so because power conferred by a majority is not exercised tyrannically, when Liberals are in office, by rejecting reasonable proposals of opponents. In Parliament a waste of time often takes place in discussions when perhaps not a single vote is influenced by them. Without making Parliament a voting machine and yet without unnecessary waste of time, it may be desirable so to regulate discussion as to shorten it when no new argument is advanced for or against a proposal. Even so, argument and discussion are futile unless minds are open to conviction. Parliament has to find time to discuss and decide matters connected with every part of the Empire, and especially with the parts that are under its direct control. There will be plenty of time to do so if unnecessary speech-making can be curtailed by the con-

stant application of the Closure or some other effective method. One plan would be for members to inform the Speaker in advance of their intention to speak on the subject before the House, and for the Speaker, or a small Committee, to select those that are deemed best qualified to speak, and at the same time to allot a certain time to each member chosen to address the House. In order to afford opportunity to new members to prove their merit, a few may be chosen alternately to speak on the subject under discussion. Such an arrangement will save time, and enable every member to distinguish himself in the subject he has studied.

Along with increased keenness of competition, or with the employment in all spheres of men and women without proper training and discipline, there has come to prevail at every step in life a spirit of suspicion that cannot be conducive to happiness or even to honesty. Those that are not honestly inclined will find means of dishonesty however much supervision may be exercised. It is a sickening sight to notice how people are watched at every place, public or private, probably in order to prevent those that are not respectable from indulging in wickedness. It would be a blessing if one could be sure that the shadower was not a hooligan, but an honest police detective, whose presence in secluded parts would be a guarantee of safety. Confidence may in some cases be abused, and suspicion or watchfulness may in those cases be desirable, but it would be a less evil if people's sense of responsibility were developed by occasional lapse and loss, and each exercised a healthy control over others, than that paid servants of lower breeding and training should interfere in the life of educated and respectable people. As life grows more complex the minds of people become more crooked. It is worth the consideration of thoughtful persons, including statesmen, whether suspicion and rudeness cannot be extinguished and general prevalence of honesty secured, as one notices in

Norwegian life and institutions, or among the classes in India that have retained their spiritual heritage and have not succumbed to modern materialism, or among all cultured people in Britain and on the Continent of Europe. It may not be beneficial to be divine to the brutal, but it cannot be injurious to be stern to the brutal and divine to the rest. It will be found that manly candour, combined with polite firmness, is not incompatible with conventionality. What is needed to remove the uncouth excrescences in life is simply a proper balancing of mind and matter.

Under the present Government Britain is fast becoming an ideal State. Great projects of social reform are advancing the interests of the humbler classes. Burdens of taxation are being adjusted according to capacity to bear them. Education and political reform are proceeding apace. The oversea dominions are becoming a confederacy of free peoples, united by allegiance to one Sovereign and by the necessities of defence and offence, and enjoying in local affairs perfect freedom of development. The only weakness in the ideal is confined to the growth of reaction in England—in England alone in the United Kingdom—and to a lurking fear connected with distant parts of the Empire, the allaying of which would make Britain indestructible, as well as morally and materially the grandest force that has ever existed in human history. The fear with regard to the Colonies is lest they should declare independence, and the fear with regard to India is lest she should wish to drive out the Europeans. The chances of both are at present remote, as neither the Colonies nor India can get on without Britain; but, even if physical necessity should become less, the increasing strength of the moral tie, based upon mutual help, respect, and consideration, ought gradually to dissipate all fear. The aim of statesmen, of moralists, and of publicists, should be, not to treat with favour or partiality any one part at the expense of another, but to develop a spirit of unity, which would revolutionise human ideas regarding inter-racial, inter-

religious, and inter-political relationship. With a continuance of the Liberal Party in power, Britain will be in a fair way of attaining the stage when it will be impracticable to separate the component parts of the Empire.

The British Empire may rightly be called, as it is the duty of good Britons to keep it, evergreen. It is always showing signs of youth, and always advancing in moral and intellectual as well as in material wealth and resources. It holds a fourth of mankind and a fifth of the earth's surface ; it monopolises a third of the world's commerce, and commands all the oceans. It nurses within itself all grades of civilisation and of culture, all races and creeds, all sorts of blood and breeding from the true "blue" to the embryonic "yellow," and all shades of skin colour. By differential treatment of its different parts British genius is enabled to retain at home an equilibrium between democracy and despotism. Its chief and unique merit, hitherto unknown in the history of States, is to unify the whole by assuring to each section freedom of development according to capacity, by encouraging in every entity a sense of pride and responsibility in the enjoyment of its citizenship, and by enlisting in its service without distinction all that are best fitted to serve it. To crown all, its head is an hereditary Sovereign free from partizanship, equally revered by all his subjects, and equally interested in the advancement of all classes and individuals for the greater glory of the Crown.

Its Metropolis, the biggest of any State and the largest agglomeration of human beings, is unique in its energy of culture as well as of commerce. Its spirit of imperial statesmanship, in which lies its strength, consists in the maxim—"Let us differ as we may inside our household, but in the presence of a foreign enemy, physical or moral, we are all one—of one spirit—aiming at one goal of brotherhood and bliss." This spirit is nurtured by the best minds in the State, not by artificial methods or by selfish motives, but by genuine consideration of one class or race for another and by hearty

good manners towards each other. Politeness in speech and act, springing from cultivation of the mind, make every individual divine and the State in which they prevail invincible. Foreign invasions ended with Hastings, over eight centuries ago, since which Britain has repelled every enemy, although at times engaged in bloody civil strife. Its liberation from religious and political bondage and oppression, begun in the thirteenth century, is being continued, and will not be ended until the descendants of the Norman conquerors and their relations by marriage cease to own in feudalism a large part of the soil and to claim by birth alone political power. Its patriotism and love of freedom are now deep rooted by antiquity and discipline. Its heroism has been established by a succession of military and naval warriors, of courageous statesmen, and of broad-minded thinkers. Its culture in every department of art and science has been stereotyped by geniuses second to none in any other land. It has not confined its happiness to itself by a selfish enjoyment of freedom and opportunities of culture, but has sought to extend them to all mankind. It has known how to combine the expediency of compromise with the enthusiasm of high principle. With the triumph of liberty and the extinction of reaction in the West, its work in Europe is established, but it has now to extend its liberating and reforming zeal to Asia, not only for the good of mankind, but to keep its faculties in order and its own liberties secure. For the prosperity and well-being of a community, a few individuals have to set a standard of breeding, culture, and morals. Mankind demands that the best, wisest, and most virtuous of individuals, classes, and races shall point to the rest the way to discharge their duties and to attain their ideals. Britons should naturally wish that they and theirs should spread and settle in every part of the globe; and, if they can prevent the succumbing of the settlers to foreign ideas and assure the continuance of British instincts and ideals, British influence, moral and physical, will be beneficial abroad

as well as at home, and redound for all time to the glory of the British name. It is time for all classes to perceive that there is nothing in a name or a symbol, and that the name or symbol is of value to humanity and to its owner only so long as it is associated with virility and virtue. For the advancement of man, at least one nation has to be the beacon for the rest. No other nation possesses at the present time the same opportunity for advancing human happiness as Britain, by reason of its magnitude, its wealth, its culture, and its power. It is the duty as well as the interest of all true Britons—Asiatic and European, African and American—to see that this opportunity is utilised to the best possible advantage, and that Britain shall, by avoidance of dangers and evil influences, which generally creep in with prosperity, continue to lead mankind towards material and moral bliss. In order that Britain may continue to be the foremost champion of human rights, Britons must insist that her policy both at home and abroad shall be based on Justice, Freedom, and Humanity, and that the Empire of Britain should be *the* State to be actuated by lofty impulses, to avoid being tainted by selfish or mercenary motives, and to wield the influence generated by superior culture and moral worth. Thus will Britain continue to hold aloft the torch lit by the greatest of her sons for the benefit of mankind.

INDIA

CHAPTER IV

INDIA

IN striking contrast to the heart of the Empire is its most dormant portion, which for a long time will demand all the ingenuity and resources of the best minds to bring it into line with the progressive sections of mankind. In human affairs absolute material equality is unattainable. For observers of the course of nature it is an interesting study to note how national forces vary—two being never equal in power, resources, and strength ; how they rise, flourish, and decay ; how one nation, through the earnestness of a few gifted and patriotic leaders and popular devotion to them rises to prominence, and controls and moulds the destinies of mankind ; and how complacency, conceit, and self-seeking among leaders of a succeeding generation lead to its decay and destruction. The force that India represents was dominant at a remote period, but through the action of short-sighted men of influence was thrown into a long slumber. Now, through the instrumentality of Britain, Providence has brought pressure to bear upon that dormant force so as to rouse it from sleep. A halo of glory is in store for those that can guide the path of the just-waking race, in the light of its great history and noble past, to the highest ideals of life and duty. It is often asserted, more in a spirit of contempt than of sorrow, that things move slowly in Asia and among southern races ; but Japan in Asia and Italy in Europe have shown that movements among ancient races

with the instincts of culture and greatness in them get quicker to their goal than movements among others that have everything to create. Quick or slow, as critics may according to sympathy or antipathy be pleased to taunt or lament, nations, not being, like individuals, subject to dissolution, may keep steadily along the path of duty and right unmindful of thoughtless or interested censure. Ridicule of first endeavours, as well as condemnation of failure, is a trait of the average mind ; but, so long as a nation does not consciously and deliberately bring about failure or downfall, and attempt to commit suicide, it need not care what others have to say, and may utilise criticism for its own good. For nations and races, as well as for individuals, a school of adversity is the best nursery, provided proper teaching is there administered. A new force, born of sorrows undergone and of duties imposed by common misfortunes, is springing up in the old bones that had been taken for dead ; and only sacrifices endured in common with equal abnegation and the faculty of organisation along right lines are needed to set the seal on the renewed vigour of a great national and humanitarian force in the affairs of the world.

India has for some time been among the most potent hindrances to the advancement of man towards the goal of bliss. Nay more, it has become the moral plague-spot of mankind. Any individual or race that deliberately refuses to profit by an opportunity of usefulness becomes guilty not only of omission but of a positive crime, since such obtuseness, apart from the suffering it entails, sets a bad example and perpetuates evil. Imitation of foreign ways without the capacity of assimilating what is desirable in them may be an evil, but deliberate relinquishment, or what is called boycott, of good things merely because they come from the foreigner is the surest way of stopping progress. Very few individuals are such prodigies as to find wisdom without teaching ; the vast majority from infancy onwards learn it from others, among whom they commence life as among foreigners or strangers.

Nations acquire wisdom from the example and teaching of other nations that occupy the position of seniors in life. While trying to assimilate the European notion of nationalism, which is a noble and ideal creed, it would be well for Indian patriots to remember that European countries have advanced, not by basing their ideals upon hatred and boycott of the foreigner and of things foreign, but, on the contrary, by absorbing all that is desirable in foreign character, methods, and teaching, and by avoiding what is undesirable in them. Before matters injurious to the interests alike of India and of mankind go further, it is the duty of friends of progress to point out to the Indian people that patriotism or manliness consists, not in boycotting a good thing because it comes from a foreigner or even from an enemy, but in emulating all that is admirable and useful in human thought and action, which alone can advance moral and social welfare. They may also point out to the censor that antipathetic or mischievous criticism and false prophecies only cause or prolong the separation and degradation of mankind.

Another way in which individuals and races in the position of India hinder progress is the ungenerous feeling which they awaken in the breasts of weak people that are otherwise civilised and educated. With the weakness of the human mind to worship success, not only are individuals and races that happen to be down or struggling for freedom of opportunity treated with scant consideration, but every possible obstacle is thrown in the way of their advance. Except a mere handful of individuals—who, being so few, are set down as crotchety—even professing friends of progress and of Indian advancement cannot speak of the people of India, or of any others whose destinies may in some manner be under their control, without an underlying spirit and tone of contempt. This is the intoxication that power causes, that tends ultimately to undermine character, that makes over some of the best and most useful persons to the domination of Satan, and that

produces animosities that better treatment with whatever achievement of success cannot effectively allay.

Public men that have a voice in the government of the Empire are in the habit of saying, when Indian questions come up for consideration, that they know nothing about the matter, and decline to express an opinion, though they will not unfrequently throw out a taunt to others who have thought of India that as they have not been to India for a fortnight's holiday it is absurd of them to say anything. Yet this does not prevent their displaying reactionary tendencies by siding with those that are opposed to any reform, and whose claim of omniscience is based on a long residence in India during which they came in real contact only with their servants. For English public men such an excuse is an admission of their unfitness to have a voice in public affairs. If they have not the time to study questions concerning the different parts of the Empire, especially the parts for whose good government the British Parliament is responsible, and which have no other means of making their wants and their grievances known, or if they have not the capacity to understand such questions, they manifestly have no right to attempt to influence such public affairs either in legislation, or in administration, or in the Press. The hollowness of their excuse will be evident from the fact that, being of the wealthy and leisured class who seldom if ever come in intimate contact with their poorer countrymen, they have no more real understanding of questions affecting the masses of Britain than of questions relating to the distant parts of the Empire. But such ignorance does not deter them from discussing and expressing opinions on questions of national moment, or from trying to embarrass the responsible ministers of the Crown. They may be justified in hesitating to interfere with the petty details of administration, but they cannot discharge their public and national duty if they do not fit themselves to criticise the acts of the men in power, and condemn such acts as on an instructed view they may consider

injurious to the State. As regards the members of the Cabinet and of the heads of departments, their business is to lay down the broad lines of policy on which the administration shall be carried on, and, when they find any subordinate disloyal, instead of assuming that his dismissal or forced resignation would injure the public interest, they should remove him out of harm's way with as little ceremony as a conscientious judge removes a criminal from his field of activity. Censure, or, when censure fails, dismissal, of undutiful or disloyal subordinates enhances the prestige of a Government, and frightens other subordinates into a sense of duty in the same way as punishment acts as a deterrent on all potential offenders.

Matters have come to such a pass in India that exceptionally strong minds are needed for the discharge of legislative, administrative, and judicial functions. Any attempts at impartiality by conscientious administrators are met by a tornado of hireling mendacity and arrogant self-assertion. They are misrepresented and reviled, and race hatred is set up and fanned to flame on the plea that any reform would injure "British rule"—that is to say, the present upholders of privilege. Newspaper correspondents and telegraphic agencies send to Britain such versions of events as are calculated to turn public opinion against India and her people, or against proposed Liberal measures. In Britain, disruptive forces take the form of class-selfishness, caste-arrogance, educated yet unsympathetic narrowness, and inconsiderate feudalism. In India, race takes the place of class and caste, and narrowness degenerates into cruel domination. The callous complacency based on past traditions of successful wrong-doing makes any advance towards fair play difficult, if not impossible. In Ireland, the policy of reaction is to make the wishes and interests of the small section known as Orangemen predominant, to allow the Irish representation in Parliament no voice in the welfare and happiness of the Irish people, and, not having the courage to exclude the Irish members, to make them powerless in the government of

their own country. In India, reaction thrives on the vested interests of a small class of temporary foreign residents, who, although by the policy laid down by the great founders of the Empire they still share the disabilities of the people of India in having no voice or share in the government, love to assert their importance by attempting to place themselves above law, and by insisting that the true object of government is to make their residence in the country as enjoyable as possible. In Britain, every great reform has been condemned by opponents as "a blow at the foundations of civilised society"—civilised society being composed of Peers and Plutocrats. And the slightest attempt to raise the condition of the people of India is represented by enemies of human progress as "undermining the Empire" or "British rule"—Empire or rule consisting mainly of foreign exploiters. In Britain, reactionaries have managed to secure the control of the vast majority of the newspapers, and are carrying on a propaganda of panic, calling a Liberal government Socialistic, and glorifying themselves as the saviours of property and society.

The Press in India—both European and Indian—is in the hands of irresponsible persons without sufficient culture and breadth of view, who are hardly suitable exponents of public opinion or fitted to guide the masses towards a right conception of their duty as citizens of the Empire. Indian newspapers take their cue from their European brethren who find it lucrative to foment racial animosity under the garb of a pinch-beck Cæsarism and partisanship of "order" so long as it permits them and their patrons to do what they like without complaint. The unity and welfare of a State can be secured only when every citizen feels a personal interest in its advancement. Its safety can scarcely be durable if a feeling of suspicion and distrust prevails between different communities or classes, or if the Government shows any tendency to favour one community at the expense of another. Recent reforms have indeed made it possible for the authorities to know

more than before of the feelings and wishes of the Indian people ; but, if the Press, which is a powerful factor in modern life to influence and guide opinion in all quarters, high and humble, were to continue to base its existence on racial separation—the Indian Press looking with suspicion upon whatever the Government does as injurious to Indian interests, and the European Press condemning any concession to Indian opinion—the outlook for India and for the Empire must remain gloomy. It is asserted that criticism weakens authority, but it is ignored that under a despotism criticism is more necessary than under self-governing institutions, and that publicity provides the only safety-valve against misunderstanding and the triumph of reaction. It is curious to observe professing opponents of criticism and publicity in India assailing his Majesty's ministers and their measures in the press and on the platform as calculated to undermine the State. Any reforming measure in India, as in Britain, must tend to curtail existing privileges and to ameliorate the condition of the general population without distinction of class or race. In India, as elsewhere, public criticism can weaken authority only if such measures are inspired by wrong motives or are meant to injure the public interest. No fear need be entertained of criticism when the conscience is clear, and no honest reason exists for the suppression of the publication of truth. Besides, even if criticism would weaken authority, there is no alternative but to wink at or to laud every official measure—a course that would only develop self-complacency and conceit, and stop all progress according to change of time and circumstance. Which of the two alternatives is the least injurious to the State, or whether there be any other course open for the advance of happiness, may be left to reactionary patriotism to propound.

Silence is sought by a type of mind which is averse to enlightenment and open discussion. Freedom of speech and of writing is demanded by another type for itself alone and silence

for its opponent. Unlimited license, unrestrained by any sense of responsibility and exasperated by attacks of privileged persons, would please a third type. In the state of affairs silence and license, abuse and retort, are equally dangerous and harmful. It is to be hoped that a sober type, determined to see the highest principles of justice maintained, will prevail and bring the other types to reason. When appeals to law, to justice, to common sense, to conscience, and to honour fail, appeals to force and violence, open on the stronger side and secret on the weaker, appear from the teaching of history to be the only resource for individuals and nations, for governments and peoples, leading to one of the three evils which hinder or retard human progress—anarchy, revolution, foreign conquest. The possibility of any one of the three is bad enough for any State, but when, as in India, the dread of all three exists in high quarters along with the prevalence of the social evils of chronic famine and pestilence, the position of affairs may be imagined.

The late leader of the Tory Party recently declared in Parliament in an Egyptian debate that Eastern people do not, like the "Westerners," care for self-government. The admission that "Westerners" care for self-government is welcome from the head of the Party whose policy is to destroy self-government in Britain and to prove that the country can never be so well off as under the rule of an oligarchy. In India, the people do not perhaps yet generally appreciate or demand self-government, although from time immemorial they had the system of organising society and settling disputes by village communities. Even the educated class—the *bête noire* of the reactionary imperialist—would be quite content with the present system if only administration, justice, and legislation ceased to be partial to a class or race. Self-government on the colonial system can hardly be the ambition or the aim of thoughtful Aryans, because that system appears to secure a greater development of self than of government—an attitude contrary to Aryan nature, teaching, and tradition. Should

means not be found by the "upholders of British interests" either to exterminate the Aryans of India or to give them impartial justice and civil treatment, thoughtful persons would naturally conclude that the best way to strengthen the Empire as well as to secure human happiness would be the association of the people in the work of government, so as to bring about mutual respect, toleration, and sympathy among the races that form the Empire. The attitude of reactionaries is inexplicable, as it must necessarily be, seeing that it is based on no principle except selfishness and conceit. When it suits the purpose of these "patriotic" defenders of "British" interests, the people of India are declared to be in a state of tutelage requiring proper guardianship. When, however, any of them commit a wrong, they are not merely not treated as juvenile offenders and sent to a reformatory for suitable discipline, but are doomed to ferocious sentences unsuitable to the most hardened and brutal criminal; and the whole population is subjected to repression and to oppressive measures as harassing as they are demoralising and unwise. It is not an undesirable thing to be under guardianship if the guardian is wise and dutiful, although a prolonged or too strict guardianship is apt to retard the virile development of the ward and to intoxicate the guardian. Wealthy incompetence and heedlessness remain all through life under the practical guardianship of factors and advisers. If these advisers are honest and high-principled, the affairs under their charge thrive, better indeed than they would do in the hands of owners that have inherited fortune and rank without a proportionate bequest of brains. The wish, therefore, to keep the people of India under perpetual tutelage because they are not capable of managing their own affairs is plausible, on condition that such guardianship provides adequately for the interests of the minor.

The allegations that chaos would reign if Britain were to retire, and that India cannot have a better guardian than Britain, are probably true within limits, although it seems

somewhat rash to form a judgment without trial, especially when such trial is not feasible. Nobody, however, can doubt that among the dominant nations of the day there is not another in which humane principles, liberal tendencies, and sense of duty are better developed than in Britain.

It is also asserted with an evident sense of triumph that "we" govern India better than she had ever been governed before. To enter into the question as to who are included in the first person plural would be out of place; but, even if the "we" stands for Britain, it ought to strike the royal claimants that comparisons are proverbially odious, and that it is no great compliment to Britain to be able to govern better than her predecessors, who are often declared by responsible public men to be semi-savages. The same "we" that govern India better also govern Britain better than before.

Superior persons in other lands, with the attitude characteristic of good fortune, are in the habit of patronising India, of discussing her fitness or unfitness for this or that institution, and of indicating the means of her salvation, which consists in giving to them absolute control over her destinies. They are apt to forget that in those other lands similar things were said and done until the day when those lands, in spite of powerful opposition, entered on the path of self-help, and that if their prophecy comes true they will only have the satisfaction of saying "I told you so," but they have not the decency to hide their heads if their anticipations happen to prove wrong. As in the case of other lands, the salvation of India rests in the hands of her own sons; and, when these succeed in placing her upon a high pedestal of honour and usefulness, all unmannerly talk will cease, and the foreigners that are anxious to patronise or condemn her will be the first to acknowledge her merit.

The attempt of certain reactionaries to frighten people with dire consequences if what they call "British rule" were withdrawn or displaced has met with some success. They might

spare themselves the trouble, as there is no more chance of British rule disappearing in India than in Ireland, or in Britain itself. The only question is whether British rule, as it was always understood by civilised mankind and as it was introduced into India—rule in which racial privileges or disabilities were unknown—is to remain actually British or to be mixed with colonial sauce and democratic imperialism. A system that is wholly opposed to British instincts and traditions, and in which fondness for Mongol methods is so openly displayed, would scarcely be designated British by patriotic Britons merely because it is administered by natives of Britain.

In the great Indian Epic *Ramáyana*, it is stated that King Dasaratha, the father of Rama, before he had issue and when he had almost given up hope of having children, was one day hunting in the forest, and accidentally killed the son of a blind ascetic who lived in it. When the King approached the ascetic to ask his pardon, the latter was so disconsolate at the loss of the only support of his blind old age that before dying of grief he cursed the King, saying that, as he had deprived the ascetic of his son, so would the King feel the loss of his own son in his old age. The King laughed at the curse, saying, "Let me have a son first before I lose him." When reactionaries—even reactionaries not confined to irresponsible ranks—fearing an advance of Liberalism in India, talk of "British rule" being endangered or of the necessity of maintaining "British supremacy," every patriotic Briton (in whichever part of the Empire he may have been born) who is acquainted with the facts may be tempted to exclaim, like Dasaratha, "Let us have 'British rule' and 'British supremacy' before you talk of its being in danger."

If India may be said to enjoy British rule when governed by the British Cabinet in London through agents that have lost their British instincts through their Asiatic associations and environments, while the Cabinet—especially when the reactionaries are in office—declares its ignorance of Indian

affairs, and is content to be guided by its subordinates "on the spot," then the rule is "British." If India has British rule under the system of government in which Liberalism seldom gets a chance of introducing timely reforms, and in which the old British principles of fair play and equality of opportunity are unknown, then also the rule is "British." If it is considered enough that the system of Indian government should be merely better than any other foreign rule at present practicable, then again the rule is "British." But surely the system in vogue in India cannot be called British by those that value the fair fame of the British name, or that consider Britain to be the greatest Liberal force extant among mankind. The system is a hotchpotch of good intentions and helplessness that may rightly be called Anglo-Asiatic. Asia in its dormant stage had become not only a field of exploitation for the adventurous portions of mankind, but also the butt of contempt of those that deem pugnacious pushfulness to be the true mark of virility. It has begun to show signs of awakening as the result of European contact and teaching, but, until it can absorb and assimilate European aggressiveness, it is likely to receive scant consideration from the reactionary and uncultured sections of mankind. Until therefore a thorough awakening takes place and success attends its pushfulness, the name of Asia will connote dormancy and lethargy, while the association of England will continue to communicate the electric thrill that will stir a reinvigorated existence. Hence Anglo-Asiatic would seem to be the most suitable name for the system prevalent in India at the present time.

After recent events, however, the system of government prevailing in India can scarcely be called either Asiatic or British. If it were British there would be some popular control over taxation, some safeguard against official vagaries, some method of prevention of the growth of bureaucratic infallibility, and some consideration for the feelings of the people and recognition of their right to expect the administration to exist

for their good. The system is not Asiatic because it pays little heed to Asiatic interests and because, although Asia is still a bugbear with a certain type of non-Asiatics, it has recently been displaying wisdom and virility scarcely approached by any country in any other continent—by the marvellous transformation of Japan into a first-class Power, by the almost bloodless revolution making China a Republic, and by the Constitutional Monarchies set up in Persia and Turkey. India and its administration, although apparently under the control of the most progressive nation of the time, may, like King Richard III., boast “I am myself alone.”

The installation of the administrative Capital at Delhi may be deemed evidence of a desire to revert to semi-civilised Mongol traditions and to shake off the principles of and connection with British constitutional evolution, unless either by a steady extension of popular representation and by a larger popular control over the administration, or by the personal association of the Sovereign with every important administrative measure so as to nullify reactionary opposition to reform, the eighth Delhi proves to be—as by Hindu tradition every eighth product is made by nature to be—the most virile, progressive, and prosperous of all the capitals that in past ages rose in the neighbourhood. The most ominous sign of the adoption of Delhi as the capital of British India, is its approval by the reactionaries. A suitable position for the new capital will be at an equal distance from the site of the old Aryan and Mongol capitals.

Fault is often found with idealists that are more critical than laudatory for not doing justice to the more or less successful attempts—sometimes made in a sympathetic spirit under adverse circumstances, it must be admitted—to grapple with the various problems of Indian government. That such attempts are made cannot be denied; and, being in power, the official view has plenty of powerful backers in and outside the bureaucracy. The weaker or popular critical side needs strengthening—a

difficult requirement, especially as in joining it one courts personal injury in one shape or another. The critics consider the official attempts at reform dilatory or half-hearted, because progress in any direction is so very slow. Besides, it is presumed that, being products of democracy administering autocratic methods, officials find it difficult to reconcile their desire to advance the welfare of the masses with their anxiety to propitiate the classes whose support is essential but that are distrusted as likely rivals for power. In any country governed on modern conditions such rulers would be speedily dismissed, as is being done in China, for procrastination, if not for insincerity. When persons take up public duties, they are well paid in honours and rewards as well as in salaries ; and if, in addition, they wish their acts of omission or commission to be above criticism, they either deem themselves infallible or are so unworthy of confidence as not to be able to stand light thrown on their acts. Minds that need applause and reward for what they do or attempt to do are poor enough, but minds that wish to avoid public discussion of their acts are worse, and are incapable of leading mankind onward to happiness. What one feels to be one's duty should be discharged to the best of one's power ; but, as soon as one cares for other people's praise, one becomes selfish and mercenary, although in public acts one has to think of the sanction of the people for whom the acts are done.

One of the grand statesmanlike utterances often made by enemies of human progress is that the spirit of the people in India, as in Ireland, has been so bullied and crushed by different interests—such as priests, landlords, and foreign domination—that they have no backbone or independence, no capacity to think for themselves or to act without foreign guidance. If this be so, any sensible person would think that the wise course is to liberate the people from their crushing yokes, to set them on their legs, and so to help them to act for themselves. Continuance under adverse conditions would have the same effects

in India or elsewhere as would have been seen in England if the supporters of King Charles I. had triumphed, or would be seen even now if reaction triumphed at a few consecutive general elections. Criticism when friendly and meant to help progress is beneficial for governments as well as for peoples ; but unmannerly criticism intended to excite antipathy, or having the effect of doing so, proceeds from persons that, whether in power or not in power, are the enemies of the cause they profess to represent as well as of the betterment of human society.

The smartest criticism that a reactionary foreigner passes upon a countryman too highly placed to be despised and too humane to be palatable is that "he does not understand the Oriental." The Aryans need not mind this type of critic, who directs his venom against Europeans as well as against Asiatics when they go beyond his miserable standard, and whose silence and change of manner it is the mission of democracy to effect. His fangs have been drawn by the development of freedom and of the capacity of the people to return blow for blow, but he still holds similar language among sympathetic comrades, or when reactionaries are in power. Under the guise of patriotism and of loyalty to authority, inflammatory appeals to bigotry, ignorance, and inherited prejudice form the weapon that the brave reactionary enemy of human progress wields to injure India in her helpless condition. The struggle that has been initiated in India by European example and teaching is not between races, as the foreign reactionary attempts to make out, but between progress and decay, between vested interests created by self-assertion and torpor, between classes—one asserting its right to domination, and the other claiming free development in all departments of life, equality of opportunity, authoritative guidance, and freedom from moral bondage. In that struggle India is seriously handicapped by the acts of some of her own sons in the past, but, if Europe has hitherto triumphed, and Japan

and China show signs of triumphing in a similar struggle, there is no reason to despair of India's ultimate success, with patience, perseverance, and reversion to her old ideals.

There are enemies of progress that taunt the educated class in India as not representing the wishes of their uneducated countrymen. They pretend to ignore the fact that it is the educated class that naturally leads in every country not under the heel of brute force or of feudal lordship, and that the educated class is much more likely to know what is good for their uneducated countrymen than the cleverest of foreigners. They would scarcely assert, although it would be logical for them to do so, that the uneducated or partially educated people in Britain are the best fitted to govern the country.

The contact with Europe, observation of the difference of treatment that Europeans mete out to Asiatics and to each other, suffering at the hands of unmannerly Europeans and consequent discontentment, have aroused in Indians a spirit of vague agitation. At present it is groping for guidance, which is discoverable only in the conduct of the advanced nations. It will gradually assume definite expression, and try to remodel the lines of social growth and unity, not in imitation of Europe, which owing to European treatment of Asia will always be treated with suspicion and distrust, but in conformity with the traditions and the genius of the people. In those traditions social injustice and religious intolerance have played at times a not inconsiderable part, but experience of the results, together with the new birth of a vigorous local patriotism, may be expected to extinguish what remains of bitterness and strife. Europeans in close contact with India may help in the quick realisation of the fruits of patriotism; but, even if from momentary self-interest any of them retard the realisation, such opposition will have the beneficial consequence of fostering the growth of patriotism, especially as the example of Europe will always be exercising its influence.

A sage said, in the days of India's glory, "It is only after many thousand births and the aggregation of much merit that beings are sometimes born as men in Bháratavarsha (Aryanland)." Things have come to such a pass that sons of that land often feel ashamed to acknowledge to foreigners the land of their birth. Moslems are more proud of their religion than of their birthplace, and look to the Sultan of Turkey as their Caliph, not to their *de facto* Sovereign, because he is of a different faith. The Parsis likewise turn a longing eye towards the land which their forebears were forced to leave several centuries ago, and to which they find it inconvenient to return. Among Hindus, who might, in imitation of their Moslem and Parsi countrymen, look to the ruler of Nepaul (the only independent Hindu kingdom, which provides the finest fighting units for the Indian Army) as their religious head, the throb of patriotism is beginning to be felt, but owing to the prevalence of bigotry and strong tradition, very few are yet in a position to subordinate religious or social considerations to national needs. Owing, however, to healthy influences from every land, it is only a question of time as to when, like the Scots and English, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, all classes and races of India will throw off their past discords and work together for the good of their common country.

It is reported that China wishes to abolish her traditional pig-tail, which in a somewhat different form used to be fashionable in Europe a century ago. It is a pity that ancient manners, customs, and dress have to be given up in order to attain uniformity, and perhaps to take away the temptation of ill-bred people to be facetious over things for which their ignorance or vanity precludes them from giving credit to their own forefathers. Attempts at uniformity can never succeed in a creation whose existence rests on diversity and variety, nor would uniformity, if attainable, do away with the vulgarity that prompts ill-manners to laugh and sneer at others. The only remedy lies in bringing about a state of things where

ill-manners can be silenced, or will be unknown—by inherent strength or by the prevalence of culture. It is difficult for better manners to prevail when representatives and supporters of the aristocracy in Britain, in the intervals of attack upon proposals of social reform among their countrymen and adulation of the Colonials, find amusement in abusing the peoples of Ireland and India. India has the great privilege of being governed socially by gods, since the Brahmins claim divinity, and politically by demigods, since the officials claim omniscience and despotic power. Under such a combination it ought to be the happiest country in the world. Satan, however, is at work to undo probable good by whispering to the gods and demigods that they are infallible, and that mere man over whom they bear sway, being fallible and finite, has no right to criticise their proceedings. The state of things might be conducive of happiness if civil war could be avoided, or “if the other dear charmer were away”; but the demigods are jealous of the gods, and the gods seem, according to demigod notions, to wish to oust the demigods from political power. The result, as in the case of war between rival monarchs, when “the crops of the fields suffer the most,” is that the interests of man are trodden under foot.

Evidence of the mixture of good and evil in human affairs and of the dominance of self in human nature cannot be better exemplified than in the attitude of two classes that have played and are likely for some time to play an important part among mankind. The higher castes in India may rightly take pride in their descent from great ancestors, but they ignore the fact that some others of their predecessors either were so small as to be unable to guard from decay and degradation the greatness handed down to them, or else contributed materially to the downfall of their race and country by the usurpation of irresponsible power, by the assertion of infallibility, and by a claim to divine origin. The power was so absolute, and the regulations made to secure it were so

strict at every step in life, that the Aryan mind in India lost all its virility and freedom of development, and has to the present day remained in bondage to an ignorant and illiterate hierarchy whose only claim to worship is reputed descent from some prehistoric ancestor alleged to have been a learned man. However just may be the claim of respect due to the possession of great ancestors, the discredit of losing such a heritage of greatness is proportionately grave. The other class consists of those who for reasons of their own deem it necessary to praise everything that is done by the authorities in India at the present day. Not being so ignorant and illiterate as the privileged castes in India, they admit at times in a soft voice that "our" rule has its defects. But they can never be got to point out where the defects lie or how to mend them. The only remedy they are capable of suggesting to improve "our" rule is to entrust fallible beings with greater powers over fallen men and to intoxicate them still more with the idea of being divine. The good that "our" rule has done is generally admitted, except by those that lament their inability to undo the good, and it needs no interested apologist to point it out. To do good to others is the duty, honour, and privilege of man ; but to claim credit for the discharge of duty and to disclaim responsibility for evil acts is a peculiar development of the idolisation of self.

In India, a Liberal administration has become an impossibility, because, apart from the vast majority of the official hierarchy having by circumstances become imbued with despotic notions, and a Viceroy however Liberal having to depend upon them for carrying out his policy, the non-official Europeans, who have come to stand in India in the position of "Peers of the realm," make it clear through their organs that any deviation from a policy of racial dominance, monopoly, and privilege will be met by a social boycott and general foreign revolt. Hence Indians often have occasion to experience the offensive "imperial manner" of little men and women that air

their importance by speaking of "our" flag and "our" government. If the animals, birds, and insects native to any part of the Empire outside India could speak, they would doubtless assert similar self-importance. Instead, however, of resenting or listening silently to such brag, Indians should likewise speak of "our" flag, government, or rule—including themselves in the first person plural. Having helped in the building up of the Empire and contributed blood and treasure for its maintenance, they have as much right as any others to claim the heritage of partnership.

The advancement of the welfare of the people of India is by no means easy, because the resources needed for progress are wanting. Human instruments are not available within; and they cannot be secured from abroad, because, owing to the political position, almost every foreigner that comes to take part in helping the advancement of the people becomes their enemy, treats them with contempt, and, while receiving their pay, undermines their interests. Young men sent abroad for education do not, for the same cause, receive the opportunities afforded to citizens of independent States; and, owing to their own want of character and patriotism, they often return home "Europeanised," that is, more fond of their own selfish interests than of their backward countrymen, while the latter look upon their foreign-educated compatriots with suspicion that they are bent upon revolutionising society. Financial resources are wanting: the country is poor, and the few wealthy individuals are generally, as in other countries, lacking in the patriotism that should lead them to help their poorer countrymen to better their lot in life.

Selfishness in India, as in other lands, takes various shapes. For example, it is well known that people who make any useful discovery in arts, science, or the crafts will not communicate the secret to any but their own sons or favourite disciples, and, failing either, the secret that would have conferred benefit to mankind goes to the crematorium or the

grave with its discoverer. The writer is personally aware of the case of a physician who discovered a remedy for dyspepsia, which causes much suffering in India, and who, being childless, preferred to let it remain unknown when he died rather than communicate it to others not of his blood. This form of selfishness is on a par with that of reactionary Europeans who wish to confine freedom and progress to persons and races of their "own blood."

Since the triumph of priestcraft in the sixth century of the Christian Era, when Brahminism succeeded in extirpating Buddhism, India has been the home of bigotry, intolerance, timidity, and uncharitableness; and now reaction, driven out from most other lands, is attempting to fasten round her prostrate form its death-grip, which she needs the virility of all her manhood, perhaps for several generations, to shake off. The hindrances that stand in the way of India's regeneration and progress are social, religious, and political. One of the three is enough to retard human advancement and lead to demoralisation; but, when all three are combined, it is difficult to conceive any other means than a cataclysm or a deluge to convert India from a moral bane to an instrument of good for mankind.

The problem for Britain is how to regulate social, industrial, economic, and political progress so that, without intoxicating any class of the community with too much importance and power, and by avoiding the growth of complacency, she may retain her great position among mankind—great for the opportunities it affords for advancing human happiness. The problem for India is how to shake off, without a complete break with her past, the evil social customs and traditions which, however suitable they may have been centuries or generations since, are no longer in keeping with modern life, and to set up on the old foundations such institutions as may enable her to take her place among the progressive forces of mankind. Early marriage is one of the great evils that have

to be remedied. In all communities, both late marriage and no marriage have their drawbacks, and there is no condition of life from which evil can be wholly expunged ; but the choice generally lies between the greater and the less of two evils, and wisdom consists in utilising experience, knowledge, and observation so as to adopt the condition which at a certain time least impedes the exercise and growth of the virile human faculties. The reasons that led to the institution of early betrothal—real marriage being impossible until a certain period in life—were based on the obliteration of the element of passion from sexual relationship ; but, the original motives were gradually forgotten or ignored, and the institution degenerated into something different from what it was intended to be. Early marriage prevailed everywhere in the ancient world, and not long ago in high life in Europe ; and, although modified elsewhere, it continues still in India because political revolutions, placing in power men of a different race and religion, removed the social authority whose business it is to introduce timely change. Matrimony, early or late, is a most serious business in life, and for those that are conscious of its seriousness and are brought up from infancy to look upon it in the proper light it matters little when they enter into it. Unless, however, by training and culture, the responsibilities as well as blessings and disadvantages of matrimony are thoroughly understood, late marriage appears to cause in a different way quite as great evils as early betrothals. The only way to avoid such evils is to place within reach of every person, male and female, the knowledge requisite for making matrimony a success—knowledge now withheld through a sense of false delicacy.

The ancient Aryan idea underlying matrimony was that it was intended to secure progeny. So long as it was accompanied by the teaching of self-control and continence, early marriage did not produce evil effects, because children were rarely born before the physical and mental faculties of the

parents were properly developed. With foreign invasions and conquests, and with the introduction of non-Aryan influence into the country, the idea of matrimony underwent change until the Aryan notion of continence at last vanished from sexual relationship. Further mischief has been done in recent years by the importation of the modern European idea of female emancipation without the discipline which, after several centuries of trial and struggle, is just beginning to regulate satisfactorily the relationship of the sexes in Europe. Social anarchy and external forces have thus brought about a state of things that is neither Aryan nor foreign, and is a negation of discipline, of duty, of home, and of virtue. Without the establishment of a social authority, which must have material as well as moral force to back it, there seems to be no possibility of blending the three antagonistic sets of ideas, Aryan, Moslem, and European. All three are struggling for mastery, but no one of them is likely to succeed in exterminating the others.

It would be out of place here to indicate how the seclusion and consequent ill-treatment of womankind stands in the way of India's progress. That treatment has been brought about by Aryan degeneracy and by foreign influences. Ancient books record the high and honoured position that women occupied in Aryan life, in the toils of war as well as in the arts of peace. Until they are afforded similar opportunities for distinction and development, they cannot be expected to be the mothers of a virile race of men, nor can men expect just treatment for themselves from foreigners, who are simply the instruments devised by Providence for punishing them for the ill-treatment of their women. Judicial proceedings prove that there are individuals in Europe lacking in the sense of duty to women, but their number is daily diminishing with the diffusion of education and the growth of a healthy public opinion. It would be some consolation if it could be said that in India the number of individuals that

honour woman is increasing. India may still justly be proud of the honour and worship accorded to the mother—an honour and worship unapproached in any other country, except perhaps China and Japan. To such worship may be attributed the Aryans' escape from extinction in spite of centuries of self-indulgence and reverses in war, and on that worship will probably be based the awakening of India into new life and vigour. Honour of father and mother, which Jesus Christ also taught His disciples, is the first principle of an Aryan's religion; and so long as he observes that principle he need fear no human enemy, and if he can extend it to his wife, sister, and daughter, and to other men's wives, sisters, and daughters, he will make himself unconquerable by man.

There is an idea among some of India's sons, as well as among foreigners, that widows are ill-treated, because widow remarriage is not prevalent as in Europe. So long as the custom prevails that every maiden must be married, widows cannot come into the marriage market and be the rivals of their maiden sisters. Prohibition of widow marriage is as unjust as compulsory betrothal of children, but neither custom can be changed or improved without the creation of a sanctioning social authority. In respectable families widowed daughters and sisters are the pets of the household, and receive more kind treatment than daughters-in-law who, being strangers from another family, are regarded with suspicion until they become mothers. The statement, however, that widows are ill-treated because they cannot marry is as reasonable as to say that maidens in Europe are ill-treated because they cannot find husbands. Married life has its troubles as much as unmarried existence, and women may, like men, be happy and useful, whether married or single, if they receive from infancy proper education and opportunities of service to their fellows.

Caste is another of the institutions which by rigidity and tyranny play a considerable part in retarding or hindering India's advancement. Caste in some form exists in every

country, but elsewhere, as in Ancient India, a member of one caste or class may by qualification, occupation, or unworthiness be shifted to another by acknowledged social authority. The system of caste as instituted, and as it prevailed until the Aryan began to degenerate, was beneficial, since it regulated division of labour for the community and assured for each occupation workers to avoid inconvenience. All had their work to do, and no question arose as to which was more important than others. No objection was taken to a member of one caste wishing to take up the occupation of another, or even intermarrying in another. As in modern European life a woman of one class or race by marrying into another becomes merged in her husband's class or nationality, in Aryan life the same custom prevailed until the commencement of Aryan decline. Then consideration of one caste for another disappeared, mutual rivalry and hatred set in, and the priestly caste succeeded in establishing its tyranny over the rest, leading each to regard the others in the same light as the "lowest" Hindu caste now regards foreigners—as untouchable. How the division has become stereotyped in Indian nature may be imagined when those that have been to Europe for education will not marry girls of other castes, and those that have become converts to Christianity will marry only such as were of their own caste before conversion. Even Europeans have not escaped the contagion. It is as difficult to find a foreign resident or sojourner who entertains liberal or broad views of racial social relationship, or who even among his own race does not try to set up social distinctions, as to find a member of the higher Hindu castes that does not in his heart entertain, and often openly assert, the natural superiority of his order.

Members of the same caste belonging to different provinces would not intermarry or dine with each other, because anxiety to retain purity of blood leads them to treat as belonging to a different caste those whose antecedents are unknown to them. It is astonishing how well the members of the caste in a large

tract of country, or province, know the genealogies of the various families. People in Europe are proud of being able to claim lineal descent from a distinguished ancestor who lived a few generations back. Every Aryan of the higher castes claims unspotted lineage from the time of the Hindu Kings, and in his case there can be no question of purity, since the slightest aberration would place an individual or his family out of the pale of society, unable even to find a barber to shave him, a laundryman to wash his clothes, or a priest to preside at ceremonies. This is the social tyranny that has taken away all courage and virility from the sons and daughters of India, and there can be no remedy for it until a social authority is created on the basis of the ancient village communities, or of representative government in Europe, to introduce reforms and to prevent injustice to individuals, families, and classes. This is one of the reasons why Indian nationalists want political reform and representative government, because it is beyond the power of foreigners, even if they had the will, to set up a standard of social justice and humanity that will not crush character, courage, and originality. It is also one of the reasons that lead reactionary rulers to partition provinces and make the different portions strangers to each other. Their cleverness, however, does not go so far as to stop intercommunication by railway and telegraph, the absence of which made members of the same caste in ancient times after long separation alien to each other, and the extension of which, along with foreign example, is leading all castes, creeds, and races in India to feel the throb of one nationality.

The authority needed for social reform cannot be set up by orators, politicians, or rulers created by European influence. It will come into being by the co-operation of members of leading and influential families in each locality, and by the formation of a strong body representing the various sections of the community. In the meantime all castes may learn from European example that social intermixture or intercourse is

not indispensable for the development of patriotism, and for service to the Motherland and to her children. The Viceroy, Governors, and high officials, although alien in race and religion, may advance the cause of social progress by sympathetic guidance and by creating a feeling of mutual toleration and respect; but, if they stand aloof either from incapacity or from sinister motives, or if they reject such social reforms as permissive civil marriage and primary education recently proposed by representative members of the Council and vetoed by the official majority, India will have to wait until men better able to guide and mould human destiny come to the helm of affairs. While waiting for guidance, Indian patriots and nationalists need not waste their energies in thinking how to drive out the foreigner, for he is bent upon destroying himself by imbibing Hindu ideas of contempt for weaker fellow-men; they should direct all their efforts and virility to extirpate the excrescences which caused Aryan downfall—the assignment to the gentle sex and to the humbler castes of a degraded status in life. Europe began to prosper, not because its natives suddenly got their skins bleached “white,” but by its conversion to a religion that taught its followers to honour women and to treat all men as brethren. Nothing in modern European life is more praiseworthy or more helpful for its greatness and usefulness than the respect generally accorded to women, and the manner in which that respect is developing the finest qualities of womanhood. India’s only hope lies in reverting to her ancient teaching and practice: *mātrivat parādreshu*, or motherhood of womankind; and *ātmanvat sarva bhūteshu*, or all fellow-creatures are deemed portions of self.

From an early period, after the establishment of caste tyranny, the Hindus were forbidden to pass beyond the limits of their country, owing to the difficulty of observing abroad the religious rites that regulated every step and every act of their lives. Thus they came to look upon their country, bounded as it was by an almost impassable mountain range on

the north, and by the sea on the other sides, as the whole world, and they called the earth triangular. A long peace and freedom from foreign inroads confirmed their error, as they diverted their energies from the arts of war and self-defence to purely agricultural and intellectual pursuits. There is a tendency in the human mind to seek diversion for itself by discussions that proceed to serious differences and end in combat. When no foreign enemy is available, the combative faculties are exercised at home. Civil war resulted, and was further encouraged by the system of caste nourishing hatred of each other and forgetting the need for mutual consideration and dependence.

While reforming her caste system, India has to guard against the example set her by foreigners in making skin colourlessness or wealth the basis of distinction. When there is nothing to be proud of in one's personal accomplishments or ancestry, it is human nature to try and find something in common with somebody that has somehow distinguished himself. Skin colourlessness at the present day enables a few among several hundreds of millions of men and women to claim to belong to a superior race. Indians may indulge in the hope and satisfaction that, as their complexion was once dominant in the world, it may by their efforts be dominant again; and they may at present enjoy the consolation of having features and black hair like the great Welshman who now presides over the finances of the United Kingdom, who with a little darker skin and a turban would easily pass as a Hindu. They may, therefore, claim importance as possessors of features and hair similar to those of this distinguished statesman, who is destined to leave a great name in history.

In the new caste distinction based on skin, which is likely to be a disagreeable factor in human affairs unless Asia wakes up quickly to abolish it, authority, position, and even culture have to declare their inability to interfere. Non-white races will henceforth have to struggle for right and justice against

white races in the same manner as the lower orders of white races have fought and won. The higher castes in India, being partly responsible for the development of arrogance and conceit, and being forced by Nemesis to acknowledge the divinity of every white skin whose shadow at one time they deemed it pollution to cross, have now to mend their ways and social institutions if they wish to escape from the new tyranny of complexion. China and Japan, where the prevalence of Buddhism, driven out of India, has saved society from caste and privilege, are beginning to resist with success the encroachments of white-skinned rudeness, have already protested with effect against being called "yellow" races, and will eventually—probably before the century is out, if the progressives succeed in controlling the destinies of China—punish the Colonial white man for his conceit in the manner recognised by himself. India has to wake up and so to reform her social institutions as to bring about cohesion and unity, which, added to her ancient culture and Moslem fraternity, will soon enable her people to hold their own against all foreign insolence and intrusion.

The present-day Aryan is too much disposed to find happiness in thinking of his great forefathers, as many petty minds among Europeans feel a pride in having something—a skin colourlessness—in common with their greater and more heroic countrymen. The Aryan, if he is really proud of his birth and blood would, instead of harping on past glories of his fathers, direct his efforts to securing equal glories of his own in the near future. Retaining all that is vital in traditional ideas, and revolutionising all that interferes with modern development, he alone can lead his country to a brighter and happier future.

The people of India, although five-sixths are of Aryan origin, have now among them Semites and other non-Aryans. There is no reason why these peoples should not feel the same pride in the past achievements of their Aryan brethren as the latter should feel in having had rulers like Akhbar and ministers like Toder Mull. The ancient name of Aryanland ought also

to be acceptable to all who have made the country their home, in the same manner as the name of Britain has been retained by those that conquered Britain and made it their home. It is possible that the name that India ought to bear cannot, any more than other questions, social, religious, and political, be settled otherwise than by an authoritative indigenous body; but in the meantime the name of the people that shed such lustre on their country may be used by every true son of the Motherland, whether of Aryan or of other origin, while every effort is made to blend all the best characteristics of the various races whose fortunes are now linked with the descendants of the ancient Aryans.

There are various matters connected with social institutions, such as the position of woman and social relationship, which at the present anarchical stage of Indian society cannot be either regulated or discussed with advantage. Women enjoy freedom in Tibet as in Japan, because the Moslem custom of seclusion did not penetrate those countries. That influence revolutionised the whole fabric of Indian society, barring the system of caste. How customs in neighbouring countries such as India and Tibet came to differ may be imagined from a few instances. Orthodox Hindus, after shaking hands with Europeans, wash their hands. The Tibetan Llamas wash them before shaking hands. Priests in India would never eat with foreigners or with members of other castes, but Llamas in Tibet eat with all without distinction, even with their humble devotees.

How character also changes along with environments is evidenced in the warlike Mongol, who, after setting up thrones in China, India, and Central Asia, and penetrating into Europe, is now as peaceful as the Tibetan. The Romans, after conquering all Europe, came for centuries under foreign subjection, but the conquered of Rome are now the great Powers of the world. If Europe has the same virtue and virility that enabled Rome to transmit her greatness to those she conquered, it will not be a dream to expect the conquered of Europe

to thrive as the grandchildren of Rome. Italy was for centuries, like India at the present time, a mere geographical expression, and after two thousand years of misgovernment and three hundred years of foreign domination was rescued by patriotism and foreign help. To raise and change the character of a people debased and demoralised by centuries of serfdom to priests and despots is a titanic task. But in India the change will be effected by continuance of light from abroad and by the internal development of a sense of right applicable to all spheres of life.

After a long slumber there are signs of awakening life in Aryanland. For individuals, slumber for a certain time is necessary for resting the forces of the system fatigued after work, so that it may resume its operations with renewed vigour. Rest is also desirable for recuperating mental strength, by communion with the all-pervading spirit in which all life has its being, and from which moral and mental strength proceeds. Nations need no rest, because the instruments that provide their vitality are constantly changing; and, so long as efficient instruments are available to take the place of wearied or decaying ones, nations need not go to slumber or relax in the race for progress.

Although the vast majority of mankind suffer from the effects of ignorance and injustice, the power of remedy lies in the hands of an infinitesimal minority. Hence the devices for securing the prevalence of social justice and informed intelligence find it difficult to make way in a democracy, in spite of the earnest endeavours of a handful of men to drive back the traditional tide. Every reform is met at the outset by the doggedness of an ignorant and alarmed opposition. The opposition itself—or resistance to sudden change—is healthy, as affording opportunity to the reform to prove its superiority; but it is often accompanied by the complacency, the indifference, and the insolence of the ancient attitude of class against class, and of power against people.

It ought thus to be distinctly understood by friends of reform,

as well as by the taunting enemies of India, that advancement of the people cannot be secured until India has the chance of enjoying a progressive political régime such as Britain enjoys only when the Liberals are in power. In Britain political power depends upon the caprice of a large body of electors who have neither culture nor capacity to comprehend broad questions affecting human government, and who vote Tory when discontented with a Liberal administration or *vice versa*. The revolt of the timid doubtful voter, who generally votes Tory through thoughtlessness, ensures at times a Liberal government. In India such a state of things is not at present possible ; it will take generations to create. India cannot, any more than other countries, be fit to control her own destinies until opportunity for acquiring fitness is afforded her. It is impossible for even any homogeneous part of the great and variegated country to prove or to develop its capacity until it has found the opportunity. Self-government cannot precede, but may follow, the free admission of the best of the people into all branches of the civil and military services, in which they may give proof of their fitness ; and especially in the department of Finance, for the control of finance is the basis of self-government. Science and knowledge are spreading too fast for timid counsels or antiquated methods to continue long to prevail in the government of any part of the British Empire ; and in the coming changes India may expect to occupy the proud position of a daughter State, and to share in the glories, sacrifices, and trials of Britain, if her people would only make the best use of the opportunities that Liberal example and guidance are affording them. It may be doubted whether self-government, or freedom, is proceeding along right lines in any section of mankind or even of the British Empire so as to advance unalloyed happiness ; and India would do well to learn by observation and experience to avoid the dangers that threaten society in modern life. Her position of comparative dependence, which under unworthy rulers and leaders may retard development, also enables her to

avoid the intoxication generally attendant on good fortune, power, and success. If she could imbibe and assimilate only such elements of freedom as would not interfere with the spirit of self-control of her traditional teaching and could act with the strenuous activity of the modern age, she would emerge as the greatest and most useful of States that have yet come into being—a blend of all that is best in every nation, age, and clime.

As in reactionary strongholds in Britain the progressive forces after successive defeats at the poll become despondent and lethargic, and refuse to contribute material or moral help to induce electors to change their opinions, so in India progressive movements not backed by official authority languish for want of support, while if backed by authority they are regarded with suspicion, authority having hitherto been reactionary or indifferent. The difficulty of getting authority to encourage progress and the hesitation of patriotic Indians to accept with enthusiasm any proposed reforms receive explanation when it is seen that even people that approve a courageous and liberal policy in other parts of the Empire speak of small reforms in India as only experiments, to be extended if justified by success, or withdrawn if unsuccessful. It does not occur to anybody to regard the concession of self-government to Colonial dependencies as such an experiment. The only matter in which a reforming tendency is displayed is in dealing with the land laws and in increasing the burdens of the cultivator. This misfortune for India is due to the want of unity and co-operation among the progressive forces of the country, and to separatist tendencies introduced into British policy by a long and unprincipled reactionary régime. It is also noticeable that safeguards are demanded, and rightly conceded, to prevent Hindus from swamping or silencing Moslem opinion, as in Ireland they are required by Protestants against possible abuse of authority by Catholics when in power in Dublin. It does not seem to strike anybody to demand similar safe-

guards for the protection of Hindus against the oppression of others in India, or of Catholics against Protestants in Ireland.

The demon of reaction has gone under in Britain and in most other parts of her Empire—never, it is to be hoped, to hold up its head again; but its exclusion from those parts has rendered it stronger for the display of its nefarious designs on the congenial soil of India. The reactionary Press in India and in Britain, when treating of the emancipated portions of the Empire, is obliged to conceal its thoughts, to disguise its motives, and to gain its ends by cajolery and flattery. In relation to India it still has free play to indulge in its favourite policy of barring and marring human advancement and happiness and of fomenting racial bitterness. It is enabled to do so by posing as the exponent of the “British” nation and the guardian of “British” interests. The mischief it does is twofold. The British Indian people, not being aware of the discomfiture of reaction in the Empire outside India, and regarding the venom of the reactionary Press as representative of British thought, conceive the British nation as enemies of their advancement and cease to cherish attachment to the British connection. On the other hand European Britons that have no time to study Indian questions for themselves regard the misrepresentations of reaction as prompted by patriotism, and hesitate to act up to the principles that in other parts of the Empire have fostered contentment and loyalty. So long, therefore, as reactionary mischievousness, masquerading in the garb of British interests, escapes the quietus it has received in Britain and the Colonies, the prospect of happiness for the Indian people is remote. In India the evil that bad administrators do lives after them, the good done by conscientious functionaries generally disappears with them. Until progress and natural development are, as elsewhere, placed beyond official caprice and racial antipathy by the co-operation of European and Indian manhood, peace and goodwill between Britain and India cannot be secured.

The ways of reaction and absolute power are inscrutable, as a little incident exemplifies. During the famine in Western India ten years ago, the Viceroy, when visiting the affected tracts, eulogised the conduct of the officials engaged in the relief operations. A few months later the President of the Famine Commission—a distinguished member of the Civil Service, with liberal tendencies, and now a Peer of the realm—was reported to have commented in strong terms on the enormous mortality in the famine camps. “The people,” he said, “died like flies, because subjected to excessive tasks, and totally inadequate provision was made for the distribution of gratuitous famine relief.” Both were high officials, and both could not have been right, unless the eulogy of the Viceroy induced a change in the conduct of the officials. The incident proves the spirit in which India is governed.

Officials of a certain type, proud of the efficiency of their sway, are in the habit of attributing to “the people of India”—meaning the class with which they come in contact—a disregard for truth. Judges, magistrates, and even imperialist organs of opinion remark at times on the increase of perjury in England. It can scarcely grow less in India; for there every white-skinned foreigner poses as the equal of the Emperor, and in his presence the heart of an Indian must necessarily

“beat thicker than a feverous pulse,
And all his powers do their bestowing lose
Like vassalage at unawares encount’ring
The eye of majesty.”

In such a situation regard for truth vanishes; when a man gets confused and knows not what to say, it seems safest to say “ditto” to whatever the “majesty” alleges or is pleased with, especially when truth finds a difficulty in being believed.

Within the last few years the political situation in India has undergone a considerable change. In the days that appear to have gone by, the political authorities were looked upon as

guardians of the people, who could be relied upon to discharge impartially the duty of the ruler—

“Ayuktakārini krodhah prasādo yuktakārini.”
(Sternness to the wrong-doer and favour to the good.)

Despotism or freedom, monarchy or republic, is not intrinsically a virtuous or a vicious system. Its qualification lies in usefulness, and it is to be praised or blamed entirely according to the use made of it. No ruler, native or foreign, can be acceptable to self-respecting minds unless he can be obeyed without a sense of humiliation. Such is the type of ruler that Indian patriotism is now anxious to secure.

The system of government prevailing in India could easily be made practically perfect. How? By relinquishment of a racial basis, by dispensing with racial supremacy and arrogance, and by abandoning the attitude of infallibility, which has hitherto been the bane of despotism. Democracy has triumphed, and is bound always to triumph, because despotism is blind to its own interests and cannot see in time the danger of the path it traverses. If the little leaven of popular control needed to make despotism prudent and vigilant could be introduced into the Indian system, the most suitable form of government for India would be installed and would need no change, perhaps for centuries, until the vast majority of people attained a standard of education and culture not yet achieved by modern great nations. The danger of internal racial bitterness would disappear with the dread of foreign invasion and conquest, and India could enter upon an era of peaceful progress, at the same time enabling Britain to be easy on the score of her security and free to devote her attention to a policy of consolidation.

Japan rose to sudden greatness because her aristocracy, under the impulse of a mighty patriotic enthusiasm evoked by men that brought home the lessons of foreign experience, laid down their exclusive privileges and invited the masses to share their high culture, noble tradition, and political power.

The want of that spirit had for long prevented China from becoming a mighty progressive force ; but what the aristocracy and the ruling dynasty failed to do has now, by an almost bloodless revolution, been initiated in that great country by the young men trained abroad. Such a democratic spirit does not yet exist among the Indian aristocracy, and the uncertainty and the danger of the situation lie in the absence of clear-sighted leadership. In other countries men of rank and high officials are the natural leaders of the people ; but in India those classes are mostly apathetic. The consequence is plain : the people, failing the guidance of their natural leaders, will look to the priestly caste, which for centuries attempted to monopolise learning and power and held India in bondage. If the aristocracy could only grasp the truth that no possessions or endowments are safe unless rationally enjoyed and shared with others, and if the bureaucracy could be persuaded to recognise that its security and usefulness lie in Indian progress, they might once more control the destiny of India.

The self-governing Colonies having become practically separate States in nominal allegiance to the Crown, Britain consists of those parts of the Empire that are ruled by the British Government and Parliament through laws made and authorities appointed by them. It is the proud privilege of India to be such a part, and she ought to feel it to be her interest to retain close connection with the heart of the Empire so long as the heart continues to contribute to her system strength and vitality. What Indian patriots and patriotic European statesmen should aim at is the recognition of India as a vital part of Britain and her representation in both Houses of Parliament by a few representatives elected in India or nominated by the Sovereign from among her people. This is bound to come with the adoption of Federal Home Rule—that is, when Parliament delegates local affairs to local bodies and concerns itself with Imperial matters alone ; but it would be bold and ideal statesmanship to hasten the day and to expedite

the process without permitting a feeling of separation to grow up and interfere with the desired consummation.

In India, Bengal has been longest under British rule and is deemed to be the most advanced as well as the most homogeneous of the Provinces, and the members of the Bengal Civil Service have generally been held in high esteem for retaining their British instincts, liberal sympathies, constitutional bias, and resistance to despotic dictation. It is no wonder that under such rulers there should have been in Bengal a greater development of nationalism and the spirit of unity and co-operation than in other parts of the Indian Continent. The aim and ambition of the Bengali nationalist is nothing less than to make his Motherland great, honoured, and revered among mankind, and to prove that the Bengali woman—as mother, as wife, as daughter, and as sister—is the model for womanhood all over the world. History does not record that any nation after its fall has ever yet reacquired greatness; but it has proved, in the case of Italy, that some physical relationship with great forefathers and some connection with ancient learning and noble traditions provide the impetus for the rise of a new nationality based on the old. Bengal has that relationship and that connection. Her enemies taunt her, as the enemies of Italian unity taunted Italy, as incapable of greatness. Bengal has, like Italy, the bitter taunts of her enemies to provide the impulse for noble, generous, and valorous deeds; and she has not a great historical past on which to cogitate and to nurse conceit, and thereby to lower her virility and her courage to initiate reforms. France, the initiator of modern freedom, helped Italy to stand upright. It would not be a miracle if England, the friend of struggles for freedom all over the world, the organiser of the Garibaldian Legion, thought of leaving a glorious name in history by guiding Bengal in the realisation of her ambition. She has not to send to India a legion to fight bloody battles or to overthrow a foreign tyrannical despotism. Her Liberal sons

and daughters have only to be true to their instincts and principles, and to induce the authorities to act in India as Britons and as they act at home. If the British Lion at the instigation of his reactionary and self-seeking sons chooses to dissemble his character of nobleness and generosity, and to play the part of the sly fox, the realisation of Bengal's dream may be retarded, but no human power can now prevent it.

It is recorded in Bengali tradition that a great religious reformer, when, as a pupil finishing his education, he was going about the country with his preceptor, collected and put away in his satchel some fruit which his *Guru* (teacher) usually ate and might require the next day. On the morrow, when the teacher asked one of his followers to fetch some of the fruit, the young pupil produced the fruit from his bag. Whereupon the teacher was much vexed, remonstrated with the pupil for becoming so worldly as to think of the morrow, and told him that he could not any longer have him as his pupil. The young man bowed down before his teacher and took his leave, saying "You have crowned to-day the edifice of my education; henceforth I know my duty." Bengal has similarly received from England the teaching that crowns her education and training, based as these are on ancient Aryan models. England may now wish to withdraw what she has generously bestowed, may test the strength of the teaching by temptations and trials, and may renounce or profess to be ashamed of her pupil; but Bengal will never be ungrateful to the preceptor that taught her the way to manhood, and the day is not far distant when Britain will, after the trial to which she is subjecting her pupil, feel proud of the teaching given, and enjoy the satisfaction of having helped in the creation of a nation worthy of her tutelage and guidance. Bengal is the most homogeneous of the Indian Provinces, and hence a reactionary Viceroy thought of creating disunion by territorial division. The little mind had not the intelligence to foresee that the administrative division, instead of dividing,

would unite the hearts of all the sons and daughters more firmly to serve their Motherland and to thwart the mischievous intentions of an enemy of human progress. Nothing in present-day Bengali life is more hopeful than the patriotic spirit that has been roused among Bengali womanhood by reactionary measures in recent years—a spirit that needs only careful fostering to enable the Bengali nation to attain its ideals.

What Bengal, having been longest under British teaching, thinks to-day, all India will come to think and feel in time. The Aryan mind with its early conception of the brotherhood of man does not look upon European Britons as foreigners, and would gladly accept their guidance if they could only behave as sons of the Motherland and guard her interests as their own.

It is a habitual sneer to speak of “half-educated Babus.” The Babus may indeed be half-educated; but, if so, the responsibility and discredit for such half-education lie at least as much at the doors of those who for 150 years have controlled their destinies as with themselves. The taunt, however, generally comes from foreigners that, while claiming “imperial” blood and brains, after spending the best part of their lives in India are unable to speak or write correctly a sentence of any Indian language. But the acumen of these critics about things Indian is apparent when they sneer at the very class to which they themselves claim to belong. Like the British division of capitalist and labourer, employer and employed, the Aryan division of mankind is unto “Babu” and “nowkar,” or gentleman and servant. It is no more a dishonour for an Indian to be called Babu than it is for “Mary Jane” to be called a lady.

Three forms of government were mentioned in Chapter II. as suitable for mankind at different stages of growth. As to which is most suitable for India at the present time, different classes and different interests naturally take different views. A popular form of government based on a democracy, the

idea of which has been suggested, like other desirable and undesirable things, by the European connection, may at once be dismissed as wholly out of the question. Democracy, in one form, has triumphed in Europe a little too fast, before the various classes have qualified themselves for the proper exercise of their opportunities, powers, and responsibilities. Even in its triumph, it is drifting in some countries towards anarchy, and in others towards privilege. With education, experience, and time, it will doubtless prove its superiority to any other system ; but its introduction in Asia, except very slowly and cautiously, as it has been tried in Britain, can only be productive of harm and risky to peaceful order and progress. Institutions that after considerable and steady struggle and training for generations have as yet not been placed on secure foundations would be as much exotic in Asia as Christianity has proved to be exotic in Europe, because its spirituality is incomprehensible to the average utilitarian mind, although it has considerably influenced the birth and growth of a feeling of brotherhood. The following extract from a Melbourne paper shows that there are among a mass of professing Christians good and true men even in the Colonies, Christians that have not succumbed to the prevailing atmosphere of conceit and irreligion, and that are alive to the dangers their morally blind countrymen are bringing upon their country :

"The heathen Japanese are setting an example in the matter of Moral Education which Australian Christians might do well to follow. A democracy based on self-seeking, mammon worship, and an anti-social individualism, destitute of and even scouting moral ideals, is a house built upon the sand, and must sooner or later, like Humpty-Dumpty, 'have a great fall.'"

The differential treatment of different parts of the Empire is in no matter so well displayed as in Finance. The Colonies enjoy practical immunity not only from the cost of their own defence against invasion, but also from any charges connected with the Colonial Office in London. India's

helplessness as well as unjust treatment is shown by wealthy Britain throwing every charge that can possibly have the remotest relation to India or even to Asia—from the cost of the entertainment of the Sultan of Turkey to the cost of the Crown worn by the Sovereign at the Durbar (India not being allowed the privilege of even retaining it)—upon the poverty-stricken, plague-ridden, and underfed taxpayer of India. The authorities responsible for Indian finance show their sense of responsibility by agreeing—sometimes with a protest—to every claim of the Home authorities, and when the two differ the authority of the “men on the spot,” so often invoked by reactionaries, goes to the wall. In such matters India becomes one with Britain, and the idea of a separate interest it is impolitic to entertain. On the other hand, at times of famine certain Viceroys have been known to refuse to appeal even for charity to the English people on the ground that they have already enough calls on their purses. The Colonials enjoy, in addition to other advantages, the comfort of having their interests guarded, not only by their own elected representatives, but also by the Colonial Secretary of State and the whole Cabinet, whichever party may be in power, everybody being anxious to conciliate them and to secure their goodwill. India, as the Cinderella of the Empire, rarely gets a minister who deems it to be his duty even to shield her from the assaults of other departments of the State. India may well exclaim :

“If she be not fair to me,
What care I how fair she be?”

It is asserted by the enemies of progress and of humanity that British and Indian interests clash, and that it is the duty of rulers appointed by the British Government to support “British” interests. Every reform in every country must, indeed, to a certain extent *temporarily* clash with existing privileges and vested interests ; but unless racial domination is to do in India what feudal power does in Britain—to bar all

progress—it would hardly be contended that the privilege of a few is entitled to stand in the way of the progress of the mass. The injury to privilege from reform is temporary, since its withdrawal is speedily followed by acquiescence; but the longer it is tolerated the more difficult becomes the task of any statesman to interfere with it, and the greater is the demoralisation of the privileged order. Besides, even from the selfish point of view of privilege British and Indian interests are essentially identical, intertwined and mutually dependent, one being unable to get on without the other, and it is the part of statesmanship to reconcile apparently conflicting interests and not to benefit one class at the expense of another. The abiding interests of the State, which should be a statesman's first consideration, are safeguarded, not by continuing the crude devices inherited from darker ages and different conditions, but by following the modern enlightened plan of resting upon the devotion of a contented people. If any British interests seem antagonistic to Indian progress, they will certainly not be promoted by encouraging the notion that justice and freedom cannot be expected from British authorities. It should also be borne in mind by those who profess pride in their British birth and blood that no British interest can be more important than to preserve intact the heritage of freedom—free development in all departments of life—which great Britons have bequeathed to posterity for the benefit not merely of those who are born in Britain but also of those over whom Britain may exercise influence. It is doubtless difficult for people born and bred with the British instincts of freedom and fair play to administer an obsolete and impersonal despotism, in which the instruments are continually shifting, and for which the methods and not the persons administering are responsible. But it will be generally admitted—unless the view of the late Conservative Lord Chancellor, expressed in a famous debate in the House of Lords, that “it would be a good thing if the Liberal Party never held office,” is commonly held in England—that it is desirable that

men of progressive ideas should either hold *some* of the highest offices in the Government in order to influence its policy or else, as in the heart of the Empire, have by turns the sole control of legislation and administration.

The Indian as well as foreign exploiters in India would for personal gain naturally like institutions that would favour their own interests. If the favour accorded to each interest could be kept within reasonable bounds, injustice and oppression might be avoided ; but the difficulty in dealing with the human mind in India, as elsewhere, lies in its insatiable desires—when something is conceded, it still wants to acquire more. The existing privileged orders would concede nothing at all ; others desire everything to be conceded at once. Progress and concession steadily maintained, even if slow, would have suited Indian conditions ; but the least concession has now become difficult, owing to the resistance of the foreign exploiters, who, with the short-sighted vision characteristic of human selfishness, have persuaded themselves that their present interest lies in retaining what they have got, even if such retention should endanger the whole in the future. Aristocratic forms with popular sympathies, such as existed in Britain before the triumph of democracy, would just suit present Indian conditions. Party government as it has developed in Britain after centuries of trial and struggle cannot be expected to grow up suddenly in India, although the example of Britain is sure to hasten the process. A party, however, may easily be formed to support the authorities in every administrative act undertaken for the general good of the community in matters touching its security from invasion and disease and its social progress, while resisting any measure that may savour of racial partisanship, until such measures become impossible as in Britain. The first duty of every good citizen is to strengthen constituted authority and also to keep over it a close and watchful control so that it may not go astray and weaken itself.

It is suicidal for the Government to side with any class

or race in legislation or in administration. Such partiality may be displayed in Britain by the Government of the day without any very great danger, because there is an Opposition always ready with a different policy to take its place, and "privilege" and "people" alternately get their chance to advance their interests. Now, if the Government in India becomes partial to one interest or class or race, it must be prepared, like the Government in Britain, to make way in turn for representatives of other interests. That being at present impossible, the authorities have to stand between all sorts of exploiters and the people. There are the landowners, who, as in Britain, desire a monopoly of the land, freedom from payment of taxes thereon, and power to squeeze all they can out of the tenants. There are the moneylenders, whose usurious rates of interest bring all unthrifty persons to misery and degradation. There are the foreign planters, who would like a sort of slavery for the security of their interests. There are the men in commerce and trade, whose interests lie in the official discouragement of all indigenous industry and talent. The Christians expect preferential treatment because the men of light and leading in the modern world mostly profess their religion. The spokesmen of Moslems claim privileges because a couple of centuries ago men of their religious persuasion held sway in India, and because the jealousies of the Great Powers of the day enable their co-religionists in some countries to retain independence. There are foreign employés on railways, in the police and other Government services, as well as in the mercantile offices, who want to tyrannise over the people and to be above the law. The thoughtless pranks of privileged sections have brought about a feeling of resentment, in which the Government itself has become involved, because its officers are believed to sympathise with the oppressors and not with the helpless masses. The higher authorities lament the oppressive acts and would gladly stop them if they could, but the oppressors

shrewdly manage to identify themselves with authority in the matter of race, and resist interference on the ground of its being subversive of "British" rule and prestige. As the personnel of the administration cannot under the existing system be changed so as to permit all classes and interests to have alternate control of public affairs, it is absolutely necessary for the officials connected with the Government to be strictly impartial and just, and to prevent any individual or class from insulting or hurting another. If this is not done, the attitude of suspicion and of antagonism to public servants is bound to grow, and thereby to weaken the State. The people know enough to understand that racial partiality is attended by a refusal of criminal and civil justice, a denial of equal opportunities, a proscription from skilled trades, and a general sense of insecurity of life and honour. Such grievances cannot but eat into the very heart of loyalty to the Government.

The relationship of England and India has arrived at a critical stage mainly through the misguided policy of a recent Viceroy. A restless rather than an energetic administrator, and unpopular even with his own countrymen and countrywomen in India for "assuming airs," he degraded the impartial dignity of the representative of the Sovereign, jealously guarded by the worst of his predecessors, to a racial partisanship. The Sovereign commands the ardent loyalty and discriminating regard of all classes in England by impartiality in all political and party controversy, by sympathy in the sorrows and sufferings of all his subjects, and by anxiety to advance their happiness. In India, where the bars of race, religion, and absence stand in the way of a cordial relationship between the Crown and its subjects, those who possess the right, or aspire, to speak and act for the Crown require to be especially circumspect in their attitude. In every State, and especially in a monarchical State, it is of the utmost importance that some one, be he the Sovereign or his representative or the head of the executive, should be not only the

source of authority and the fountain of justice and mercy, but also the moral and social leader of his people, setting up a standard of manners and an ideal of character. Under existing circumstances the Sovereign of India cannot exercise these rights and powers associated with sovereignty. A theatrical *coup* gave the Sovereign of India the title of Emperor without any of the powers pertaining to the position of Emperor. There is no august and impartial personage in the Empire to whom the people of India may look for relief from their miseries and grievances when their immediate rulers abuse their trust by becoming racial partisans. The "Emperor" is now and again advised by his ministers to issue a proclamation containing liberal sentiments in as guarded language as circumstances permit, it having been found "impolitic" to carry out the policy announced in Queen Victoria's gracious proclamation of 1858 as well as in the Act of 1833. Herein again the Sovereign is placed in a false position and made to lose the respect and loyalty of his subjects by appearing, like ordinary politicians, to practise hypocrisy—to say one thing and to do another. People in India cannot be expected to appreciate the position of a "constitutional" Sovereign. They know that their Emperor is as omnipotent and impartial as God Himself, and they do not understand the motives and the system which confer titles unaccompanied by power. Under present circumstances, absolute power in the hands of the Sovereign exercised through competent instruments not of any particular race or creed, but chosen impartially without regard to race or to creed, will do more good than the introduction of self-government or democracy. The Sovereign can do no wrong, not merely because wrong-doing is dissociated from sovereignty, but because he has no poor relations and friends the consideration of whose interests prevents humbler persons from discharging their duty impartially. Another "wisdom" of a Conservative administration is the latest title conferred on the Sovereign. He is King of "All British Dominions"; and, as India is

expressly excluded from those dominions, none but "imperial" brains can explain how when that title was conferred India still continued to be a portion of the British Empire. If India, being under the direct government of the British Parliament, is not among British dominions and is regarded as a mere dependency, it may, like Heligoland, Samoa, or the French Congo, be any day surrendered to a foreign Power. Its people cannot be expected to be certain of and loyal to existing conditions. The aim of progressive British manhood, European as well as Asian, must be to give it a more honourable status with a view to secure a permanent union.

European example has given birth to a type of mind that is bent upon destruction. It aims to destroy what it deems objectionable to itself, and to conserve or to set up what it deems desirable in the institutions of the Motherland. So far, happily, this type appears to be insignificant in numbers. In Europe and America there are minds whose selfishness and mischievous propensities are so developed that they have formed organisations for the destruction of all that conduces to the happiness of life. In these days of speedy communication between different parts of the world, their evil example is sure to spread; and it is to be feared that in India what is at present a comparatively harmless type will become as dangerous as elsewhere. Anarchist conspiracies have come into being in democratic as well as in monarchical States. In Britain alone they are non-existent, because a strong Liberal Party, composed of cultured members of the best families as well as of the masses, is bent upon advancing the interests of the humbler and labouring classes.

The Colonies have also been fortunate enough to escape the introduction of revolutionary methods for extorting rights—the use of bombs, Brownings, and violence as an expression of grievances against unjust treatment—because the ruling authority has always been just, generous, and anxious to conciliate Colonials by timely concessions. India, having

been refused the treatment accorded to all other parts of the Empire, seems to be the only portion where secret conspiracies will be hatched and open violence exercised, with the result of enabling reaction to triumph and to impede progress! When moderation and sense vanish, the extremists have their day.

Anarchism implies disbelief in God, in Government, and in Law. To designate as anarchists people that appear to be ardently loyal to their Sovereign and only to wish to liberalise the institutions in order to advance the happiness of their country may be natural for those that condemn their acts or motives, but it does not represent matters correctly. In their anxiety and impatience, the extremists may have thought of punishing officials that they deemed to be enemies of the people and consequently of the welfare of the Empire. In order to provide themselves with necessary funds, they are alleged to have been incidentally engaged in a conspiracy to endanger the institution of private property. Yet their proceedings, if correctly reported, though illegal and criminal, cannot properly be called anarchical. They have imbibed ideas of freedom, impartiality, and justice from the political and social connection with Britain. The moral contact with other countries through the British connection has taught them revolutionary ideas of violence, which have long since been discarded in Britain, but which are still resorted to on the Continent of Europe, where principles of fair play, freedom, and justice have not yet, as in Britain, triumphed. In addition, they labour under the disadvantage of not finding the guidance necessary to direct their energies into the proper channel.

The fateful mixture of evil with good in human affairs is markedly exemplified in India, where the great benefits conferred by progressive rulers are being endangered, not only by the importation of European methods of extorting rights by violence, but also by resistance to legitimate claims until circumstances compel their satisfaction. Under such condi-

tions, all interest and affection of the rulers for the people under their care naturally disappears, and all sense of popular gratitude for benefits received is lost, because the satisfaction comes, when it comes at all, too late and after struggles that inevitably generate bitterness. Whatever may be thought of the acts or intentions of a few individuals, the authorities themselves declare that the vast majority of the people are solid in favour of the Government and of legality and order. Under those circumstances, they would prove their sincerity and display their wisdom by reposing confidence in the population as a whole and by substantial recognition of the justice of the popular demands.

Anarchism is a creed hitherto unknown in Asia. It has been imported into Japan, where one would have thought that it had the least chance of introduction after the enormous services rendered to the country by its rulers. After fifty years' enjoyment of freedom and attainment of the position of a great Power Italy has not, as the Camorra trial proves, been able to get rid of anarchist conspiracies. In India the policy of physical violence appears to be directed, not against the Government, but only against particular officials for unpopular acts. Now, however, that it has been introduced, those that are conversant with the workings of the human mind will hesitate to affirm that even the establishment of popular government will eradicate the seed. Liberty consists in the emancipation of conscience and of every desirable form of mental and physical development from antipathetic or unsympathetic power. Anarchy, revolutions, or sudden popular outbursts do not help such emancipation or progress, as they wake up in the mind forces that are inimical to orderly and reasonable freedom. The gradual but steady substitution of freedom for force in human institutions is the only feasible way of bringing it about, and the effective voice in government of the best citizens in a community is the easiest way to secure the substitution peacefully and permanently.

Considering how little is to be hoped from the attitude of reactionary officialism in India, liberty, citizenship of the Empire, and equal rights with other Britons can be attained only by sacrifice. But sacrifice is impossible where disunion prevails; and disunion is bound to increase if the utility of constitutional agitation comes to be doubted, and recourse to violence and political crime is regarded by any considerable number of the rising generation as the only means of securing justice and fair treatment. For this lamentable development the unbending despot is as much responsible as the unbalanced youth. The reforms that have been initiated by the Government are due, not to the croaking and opposition of reactionary privilege, but to the persistent criticism of Indian administrative methods by high-minded and well-informed Englishmen whose British instincts and liberal sympathies have survived a lifelong connection with India and Indian conditions of life, and by other Englishmen that have had the foresight to perceive that evil methods if continued will not be confined to India. In view, however, of the example set by other countries and of the teachings of history, it is vain to expect a complete cessation of violence by unbalanced and youthful minds until two things are assured. In the first place, the instigators in the reactionary camp must be silenced; and, in the second place, authorities charged with the preservation of order must, like their brethren in more civilised communities, deem it their duty to control crime, and not to concoct it, and not to get the innocent punished when the guilty cannot be caught.

A great deal of nonsense has become customary in connection with the word "loyalty." A hypocritical pretence is made by some persons to preach loyalty to others, while they themselves would never think of being loyal if anything they hold dear were in danger. The reactionary European calls Indian and Irish nationalists disloyal while his own loyalty depends upon being allowed to run all India, Ireland, and even

Britain, in the temporary interests of the small class to which he belongs. In these sermons, loyalty to conscience, to a sense of right and duty, to the eternal and sacred principles that have always governed the thoughts and acts of the noblest type of man, is held up to ridicule ; while loyalty to emissaries of reaction, Satan, and selfish greed, is declared to be necessary to avoid "chaos and deluge." India has survived chaos and deluge, and probably will continue to survive them. It managed also to exist and thrive before foreigners came to its rescue ; but it can scarcely escape moral deluge and death if hypocrisy under the garb of loyalty struts about as an upholder of law and order. To expect loyalty from people that are denied the rights of humanity is to think like a polygamous husband that casts his eye and favour as caprice dictates, but claims constant love and devotion from his wives. In both cases iron bars and stone walls are the only guarantee of fidelity, and loyalty so dragooned may be pleasant for the temporary holder of power, but it is a travesty of truth to expect it to be sincere.

Loyalty to the Government is a virtue practically unknown in Europe. In Continental countries it has to rest on overwhelming force, and when the Government becomes so unpopular as to sap the discipline of the army a revolution upsets it and brings in a new order. In the heart of the British Empire, where reactionaries are so fond of preaching loyalty to Irish, Egyptian, and Indian nationalists, it would be difficult to find any ardent or blind loyalty. The whole nation belongs to one or other of the two parties that alternately govern the country and the Empire, and it is the business of each party when the other is in power to condemn all its measures and to try to oust it from office by any means short of brute force. The official Opposition has recently even gone so far as to instigate rebellion if Irish Home Rule is granted by Parliament. It would be well if European reactionaries and advocates of violence set to the Indian people a better example of loyalty to the Government of the day.

Lamentation is often expressed by professing partisans of law and order that the people do not co-operate with the Government or help the Police in the detection of crime. The lamenters do not explain how the people are to help when they themselves declare that the attempts at political crime are confined to a few persons and are in the nature of conspiracies. Unless the conspirators carry on their designs openly in public, it is beyond the power of innocent persons to bring them to the notice of the authorities, and the guilty cannot be expected to betray themselves or their comrades. If by co-operation is meant the false implication of neighbours, such co-operation, however pleasing to a certain type of authority, cannot advance the cause of order. If, again, the conspiracy is so general that a considerable number are implicated, it is for reasonable minds to say whether law and order are endangered by those that rebel against or by those that speak in the name of authority.

In contrast with the lamenters is the attitude recently assumed by the Government towards several young men accused of political crime. Their discharge proved how British instincts triumph at times in India in spite of adverse conditions. When the head of the Judiciary sets, as the present holder of the office at Calcutta does, a higher value on justice than on racial domination, and when the head of the Executive fresh from home does not succumb to the reactionary poison continually poured into his ears, the people feel happy and British rule may be said to prevail. The policy, naturally unpalatable to the reactionaries, is as wise as it is bold: it is by such wisdom and courage that true statesmanship has in human history always been distinguished.

Justice is the foundation on which his Britannic Majesty's rule in India rests, and it is absolutely essential for that rule not only that there should be justice, but that the people should have faith in it and reliance on its impartiality. It is the interest of everybody to see authority vindicated, but it is

the interest of authority to be so just and impartial as to command respect. The Lord Chief Justice of England expressed the opinion the other day in a case before the King's Bench that "discussion of independence is not seditious." This opinion of the highest British judicial authority would scarcely be acceptable to Anglo-Asiatic judges who define disaffection as "want of affection," and consider criticism of official acts equivalent to holding up the Government to contempt. Deportations without trial, secret trial, and other such drastic measures are scarcely necessary in a country where justice in the British sense is in its embryonic stage and where accusation generally means conviction when the trying judge is a civilian and the jury European.

In national affairs more than among kith and kin sympathy and impartial treatment are of importance, since among different classes and races, widely separated, common ties of blood, breeding, and association do not exist, and a feeling of self-interest, deepening by time and companionship in joy or sorrow, can alone keep them together. A feeling of pride in the union must also exist to give it a chance of permanence. The main hindrance to a cordial relationship between England and India is the atmosphere of suspicion, which is found by sensible people so difficult to dissipate, and the consequent feeling, which pervades the English mind more than the Indian, that the two can never combine or feel an attachment for each other. Greater animosity used to be felt not so long ago against Catholics and Jews, and is still nursed by the well-to-do class against the labouring population in Britain; but it has been and is being mollified by wise statesmanship and legislation, and is never again likely to stand in the way of cordial co-operation in national affairs. There is an idea among some people that unless there is social sympathy political unity cannot be secured. This is a mistake which is readily perceived in the growth of modern nationalities. Inter-marriage and friendly social intercourse do not prevail

between class and class or between families in different strata of society in Britain, or between Colonial magnates and the British peerage, any more than they exist between the different castes and creeds in India, but the absence of such intercourse does not stand in the way of everybody putting his shoulder to the wheel when the Sovereign and country are in danger. There is no reason, except the insane prejudice created by uncultured Colonial action and legislation, why India and her people should not form as much an integral part of the Empire as are Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, and much more than the Colonials are likely to do. To secure that end, however, the indispensable conditions seem to be that the Colonies should be induced to change their attitude, and Anglo-Indians resident in India, as well as the Indian people, should feel that their interests and those of their friends and relations lie in fostering mutual toleration and respect. The inhuman treatment meted out in the colonies to British Asiatics will stand in the way of cordial relationship between Asia and Europe, or between Britain and India, so long as Britain acquiesces in the Colonial attitude. Colonials, however, may become civilised enough to change it before it is too late, or may cut themselves adrift from the Empire as soon as they are strong enough to resist invasion. Britain and India will then march along side by side towards the goal of forming an ideal State, if the old British spirit survives the assaults which are now, and will for some time be, made on it from various quarters.

India may at present be described as that part of the British Empire whose physical union with Britain is separated by six thousand miles of land and water, and whose moral union with Britain is hindered by the reckless rhapsody of the reactionary rabble and by attachment to the Crown of a separate title derived from it. The Indians are described as a congeries of races and creeds incapable of combination, of modern education, of British citizenship, of strength of character, or of tenacity of purpose. Yet the

reactionaries are so afraid of them that they endeavour to cramp or to mar their education, are eager to control their sojourn in foreign lands, and cannot sleep in peace unless every Indian is imprisoned without trial for objecting to inhuman treatment and to separatist vituperation. It is deemed prudent to ignore that India and her people existed before any European set foot on her soil, and that evils similar to those from which India suffers were not long ago, and are still, not unknown in Europe. If China with its different races, creeds, and languages can, like Austria, Russia, and Switzerland, form one State and nation, the hope of India becoming one nation and getting fused with Great Britain is not forlorn. Time will show that more things happen among mankind than reactionary intelligence can foresee or comprehend. The function of that intelligence is merely to retard human progress; but as mankind is bent upon progress the time may not be far distant when the occupation of reactionaries will be gone.

It is often asserted that India, not being able to govern herself, will be better governed by foreigners than by her own people. Foreigners, it is argued, not having sympathies or antipathies, not having relations or friends to benefit, and being thoroughly impartial as between rival claimants and litigants, ought, if endowed with foresight and wisdom, to be able to govern any country well. But there is a weak point in the argument. Foreigners, when successful, always manage to gather round them their friends and relations, even their own countrymen and women as such, and, ceasing to be impartial, govern worse than the worst natives. An experiment towards which affairs are tending will test the theory. Now that Tories in Britain think that Liberals cannot govern rightly, and Liberals are satisfied that it would be disastrous to be ruled by Tories, while both parties profess a great fondness for their "kith and kin" across the seas, there may be given to Colonials, who are neither foreigners nor natives, and who have been made the pets of the Empire and credited with all the virtues, an oppor-

tunity to try whether they cannot govern the Empire better than Britons. Tories seem to be bent upon trying it, having recently elected a Canadian to be leader of their party. If the goodwill of all Britons—except perhaps the Asiatic Britons, who of course do not count—is of any use, Colonials ought to make the best rulers of Britain and her dominions. This claim will doubtless be urged when they have somewhat further gained in importance in the eyes of the European Britons and their rulers.

The difficulties presented by distance in space, in race, in religion, and in complexion, appear to form a barrier which the culture and courage of European statesmanship have not yet advanced far enough to be able to overcome. In Europe, religious intolerance, the prejudice of religious difference of Protestants against Catholics, of Catholics against Protestants, of Anglicans against Nonconformists, and of all Christian sectaries against Jews, although it has not yet been quite overcome, is on the wane. A common bond in other matters, and especially a common skin complexion, on which more stress appears to be laid by democracy than on rank, class, or blood, is helping to assuage religious animosity, which is kept alive only by the interested attitude of priests, while distance in space and race is being daily lessened by quicker methods of locomotion. When, however, all of these difficulties together come into play, there seems to arise an antipathy which a long period of intercourse and mutual acquaintance can alone remove. Here and there a man or a woman in humble or prominent positions may be observed to possess the inner vision of the essential unity of the human mind, or to disregard the differences in the outer garb in which human existence is created to be clothed; but it seems vain to expect that a general movement towards emancipation and union, of equality and justice, of fair play and free development, will receive the earnest support of those that speak in the name of democracy, so long as democracy has to fight for its own rights against aristocratic

pretensions; or that the natural and ennobling desire of every individual to stand as a man among men, and of every nation to occupy an honourable place in a fraternity of nations, will be satisfied without a good deal more bloodshed, drilling, and repression. The present generation of aristocrats has, on the other hand, lost that sense of chivalry and those gentle manners which led their forefathers to come to the rescue of the weak and helpless, and is anxious only for the retention of power and privilege without the corresponding obligations.

Individuals and races that happen to be down are thus thrown on their own resources, which certainly is the best means of developing manhood, but which without guidance is necessarily slow in results. They have to be on the look-out for a great hero who may some day appear unstained by the passions, prejudices, and weaknesses of the average humankind, and who will by the force of his character carry with him into the fray a number large and resolute enough to turn the field at any odds in favour of human rights and against the thralldom which has hitherto held the mind in bondage. In the meantime the duty of those whom adverse circumstances have placed in the difficult position either of suffering without hope of relief or of feeling for human woes without ability to help, is to work silently, steadfastly, and unobtrusively, to be ready to pass through the requisite period of tutelage and preparation, imbibing the right spirit of discipline, of patriotism, and of humanity, and, undeterred by the assaults of ignorant forces around, to keep steadily in view the goal which would end human miseries and transform human existence into divine. The direction of European culture has taken a turn that forbids the expectation of its help in the realisation of that goal. Salvation therefore must be looked for on the continent that after a long and deep sleep shows signs of awakening—the continent that by giving birth to the great and humanising religions of Aryanism, Buddhism, Christianity, and Mahomedanism, proclaimed the brotherhood of man.

The task before Asia is not an easy one. The treatment that Asia has for several decades received, as the hunting-ground of European adventure, may wake it up to a state of mind foreign to its high breeding and culture. Strict methods of people in the position of guardians and teachers, when not too unkind to blunt human feelings, exercise a sobering and chastening influence on the mind; but, when inhuman, they may generate feelings of revenge and of retaliation, and may even convert the good communicated by the contact into an object of suspicion. A wrong once perpetrated may be obscured, but it can never become a right again. Among individuals a wrong always rankles, necessitating the nursing of a revengeful feeling. Among nations a wrong often proves beneficial for the wronged in so far as it helps to rouse national union and consciousness. To take advantage of other people's weakness and to make as much as possible out of other people's sufferings may be in accordance with approved business principles, but the perpetrator must be prepared for retaliation at a suitable opportunity. This is the danger through which Asia is now passing, and to which wild spirits in China and India appear to be succumbing. Japanese wisdom has so far managed to avoid the risk, because Japan has, under the guidance of a handful of gifted men trained abroad, combining the virile qualities of the East and the West, conceived the strength and potentiality of its national destiny and has based it on Oriental idealism and culture. It is to be hoped that the lesson and influence of Japan will be more potent to keep Asia as a whole in the path of humanity and virtue than the evil example which the intoxicated portion of Europe and its descendants, who after discarding Europe and its traditions still deem it prudent to pass as Europeans, are setting for the guidance of future generations of man.

In human intercourse it is natural to wish to derive as much profit as possible and to avoid risks and evil influence; but such risks and influence can never be avoided. The influence

of India on British politics is perceptible in a slackening of the enthusiasm for human rights, a greater appreciation of class and bureaucratic domination, a wider recognition of the claims of birth, blood, and wealth, and a growing disposition not to trouble about thinking problems out for oneself, but to leave the solution to such as may attain prominence. It is also observable in the barbaric idea of Empire entertained by a considerable number of prominent personages. In social matters, the influence is apparent in the worship of title and position, in a disposition to minimise "high-born" deviation from good manners, and in the increasing desire for luxury and pleasure. In religious life, it is observable in greater intolerance and attention more to outward symbols than to spiritual conditions. It would have been impossible for the reactionaries, without even any leaders of commanding genius, to hold political power for twenty years, or for the House of Lords to claim rights over finance, unless British traditions had been undermined by Asiatic influence. It is doubtless the wish and interest of the "imperial" mind that the influence of Asia should extend in Europe, and thus counteract the growth of Liberal tendencies. But even Asia is becoming too progressive to be palatable.

At the present stage of development, the safest means of reconciling conflicting interests would be to vest supreme power, in fact as well as in name, in the Sovereign himself as Emperor of India alone unconnected with any other part of his dominions. The assertion and display of Sovereign power by the Sovereign, who has no personal interests to serve, would remove all friction between classes and races and bring about harmony and sympathy. The Sovereign, being wholly "constitutional" at home and thus having no active functions of government to discharge, should have no difficulty in attending to the part of his dominions where he is now nominally the despotic ruler, by having round his throne such advisers as he may select, both European and Indian, to place

before him for decision all important matters that arise from time to time owing to apparent antagonism and divergence of interests. It would be fortunate for India and for the Empire if the King's influence in administration could be exercised at all times, especially in every acute controversy.

It is asserted by reactionary opponents of progress that Asiatics understand only "strong" government, and cease to respect humane methods of rule. It does not appear that in any country in Europe order can be preserved by its Government, whether monarchical or republican, without a strong force of military and police to back it. Human nature, whether Asiatic or European, appreciates and respects strong government when its strength lies in impartiality, justice, and due discharge of the functions of government; but, when reactionaries speak of "strong" or "firm" government, they mean by it high officials who should have absolute and irresponsible power, to whom ideas of justice and fair play would be a mockery, and who are to favour races and classes according to their disposition to say and to do things most pleasing to their patrons. If Asiatics do not yet understand democratic rule, neither does it look as if all Europeans comprehend or deserve it; but Asiatics, as much as Europeans, will be found to lose all respect in their hearts, if not venturing to express openly their contempt, for rulers who act as if Asiatic human nature were different from European, and who, lacking the faculty of understanding the feelings and interests of those placed in their power, deem it "strong" government to trample upon them.

The contact with Europe is awakening to life one-fifth of the human race, who were groping in the Cimmerian darkness of priestcraft, superstition, and self-complacency. On the other hand this contact has caused evils; and prominent among these is the undermining of good manners and of the old-world politeness for which Asia was justly famous. The European does not understand the polite salutation and con-

stant desire to please shown by the average Indian towards the foreigner as towards his own countrymen. As the English traveller misinterprets and laughs at the polite consideration shown to strangers in some Continental countries, so the European misinterprets the Indian: he imagines the politeness of the Indian to spring from sycophancy. The Englishman especially, not being accustomed to such display of politeness at home or in the Colonies, and intoxicated by the notion of his racial importance and privilege—a notion drummed into his head by the reactionary Press—is easily persuaded that Asiatic politeness proceeds from servility. The result is that it is perceptibly diminishing: in a generation or two it will be as rare among Indians as it is among the Colonials. As injustice, reaction, and privilege are responsible for the birth of revolution, the contact of India with Europe, as of Europe with America, will prove to be the death of good manners in India, if not in the whole of Asia.

Good breeding restrains one from losing one's temper, and from saying or doing anything to hurt another, even under great provocation. This attitude of mind is in modern life called civilisation, and is to be found among well-bred people of all classes in Europe and America. According to ancient Aryan ideas, it is due to knowledge of self, which prevents one from injuring anybody else because every one is a part of the omnipresent entity. True patriotism has a similar basis, so that one ought to be incapable of hurting a fellow-countryman, or of doing or saying anything that might lower him in the estimation of others. India has inherited good breeding, but has not yet developed patriotism, either among its official leaders or among the generality of people. Failing patriotism, there is danger of her losing through contact with the foreigner her precious possession of high breeding, without gaining in exchange the laudable traits in his character.

After centuries of struggle "white" men have conquered the right to justice and fair play, although attempts are still

not wanting to deprive them of the prize. After considerable suffering for generations, Ireland has secured from the Liberal Party the admission of her right to manage her own affairs in her own way. India will have similarly to struggle for generations before she can hope to get what Ireland has got after so much trial and trouble. During the process bitterness is bound to be generated ; but with the dawn of light it is sure to disappear, and the struggle will develop virility and fitness for rights. About every half-century, under the guidance of a great Prime Minister, rights of British citizenship have been conceded to subjects of the Crown. The Colonials, the Catholics, the Jews, the British householders, and the Irish have had their turn, although at long intervals, needed for preparing the governing mind and conscience to make the concession. The turn of India is next to come, soon or late, according to the alacrity and wisdom of Indians in unifying themselves and in displaying their best qualities. When they do so, they will find authority, in whomsoever it may be vested, sympathetic and helpful to all national efforts for advancement. They need not mind the taunt of sycophancy hurled at them by people that are friendly to Indian aspirations of honour and usefulness, when they observe that sycophancy is not unknown in other lands—even in lands that have not been under foreign subjection for generations or centuries, though perhaps the sycophancy there displayed towards Peers and Plutocrats may be less obvious to the worshippers than to observers. In India, however, as in Britain and elsewhere, this weakness will be found more frequently among the comparatively well-to-do middle class than among the labouring class. In India it is not due to foreign subjection, unless the foreigner is taken to be a barbarian or a tyrant, and subjection to authority is deemed to be sycophancy ; it is due partly to the social system, in which deference to a superior is a matter of duty, and partly to the training, which enjoins politeness even to an uninvited guest. The unobservant or ignorant foreigner,

accustomed to rudeness among servants and the lower orders in his own country, deems Indian servants slavish because they know not how to be rude to their masters. What is independence in non-Asiatics is construed as impertinence in Indians. In the eyes of the reactionary critic of Indians, whatever they do is wrong, their virtuous acts and thoughts are ignored or misread, and any individual slip is made to serve the purpose of a national castigation. When Indians show love of fair play and manliness and liberal tendencies, they are taunted with blind imitation of the foreigner. When they show deference and good manners, they are branded as servile! The best thing they can do is to go their own way, to assimilate the best knowledge and thought of all races, and to remember that the respect of all foreigners—good, bad, or indifferent—will be secured only when they stand on their own legs and do not mind foreign criticism. In England, Tories rule only when progressives are divided; in India, reaction and unsympathetic despotism will prevail so long as the Indian peoples are disunited and remain the puppets of the artful dodgers—foreign and Indian—whose personal interests are served by their disunion.

The political system prevailing in India might have been suitable at the time it was introduced, and might still be suitable if the conditions remained unchanged. In ever-changing nature no conditions appear to be invariably applicable at all times, and no specific is a standing remedy for every phase of human ills, moral and material, or is suitable at all stages of human development. While, therefore, physicians of the old order, who have not kept pace with the later developments of science, may not unnaturally maintain their faith in the efficacy of old methods, a younger and more active generation abreast with the times may deem other remedies opportune, and may, at least for the sake of experiment, apply the teaching of later discoveries. As hospitals with poor patients and helpless inmates

are suitable for medical experiments, so is human society in its disorganised state, as in India, a proper field for experiments in all departments of human activity. Resistance to youthful activity not only retards progress in the path of happiness of the people most concerned, but also stands in the way of general illumination of mankind in the arts of organisation and culture. Such resistance must prove futile in the long run; though meantime there are patients of the old order, as well as antiquated physicians, who regard new methods with lively distrust.

Uniformity of political systems under varying conditions of existence is no more practicable than uniformity of treatment for all physical ailments. The Colonial system of practical independence of the central authority (except as yet for purposes of defence), which appears to have taken hold of politicians in India and their friends in Britain, would at the present stage be disastrous for India. Its efficacy even for Colonial human advancement has not yet been proved. There are not wanting indications that the immigration of needy and uncultured persons from Europe, however useful for peopling extensive tracts of undeveloped land, does not advance moral progress without a corresponding importation of cultured minds of the better European classes. A governor is the only person of the cultured class that is nominated and sent out to maintain connection with the motherland; but he is practically a figurehead, with no power to interfere with the decisions of the cabinets over which he nominally presides, and which consist of the representatives of the local people and represent their standard of culture. In any case, India, in its condition of political dependency, has this important advantage over the Colonial independencies: it is able to draw on Britain for the best intellects and social leaders. Superior men would be attracted to India if they had the opportunity of exercising their brains in different spheres of life, and of moulding the destiny of several hundred millions

lie premature possession of power. Indian patriots and their European friends would do well to be warned by events in Europe and America and the Colonies, and not to hanker after political systems that appear to invoke violence as the means of gaining temporary ends. India has still the chance of avoiding the dangers, and its thoughts should be directed, not towards uncultured democracy or Colonial independence, but towards free development of the energies and resources of its people. Such a course, based on the peculiar culture and traditions of India, might yet, under suitable guidance, transform ancient Aryanland into the model State of mankind. That guidance it is the duty of the official leaders to provide; and, if they fail in that duty because social pressure is too strong for the sense of dutifulness, or because they attach greater importance to their difference in race than to their position of authority, India will have to wait until Providence deems the people worthy of dutiful leaders in the ranks of power and of a strong and sympathetic minister at Whitehall.

Good government and progress in India at its present stage of development depend upon the complexion of the Cabinet at home and upon the Viceroy on the spot. Almost every Viceroy sent out by a Liberal Government has advanced the welfare and happiness of the people; but the present Viceroy bids fair to outshine most of his predecessors in courage and foresight. The secret of success in Indian administration lies in introducing desirable changes without making any fuss and noise and without rousing the ire and suspicion of the watchful horde of reactionaries in India and in Britain. Another way of initiating reform without risk of failure through the opposition of vested interests is, as has been done by the present Liberal Government in South Africa and at the Coronation Durbar in India, to use the prerogative of the Crown. The despatch of Lord Hardinge recommending the administrative changes announced at the Durbar by the Sovereign himself has laid the foundation of Indian Home Rule. It

indicates that step by step "India will consist at last of a number of administrations, autonomous in all provincial affairs, with the Government of India above them all, and possessing power to interfere in cases of misgovernment, but ordinarily restricting their functions to matters of Imperial concern." This is the most brilliant and authoritative exposition that has ever been made of the formation of the future United States of India with their centre of gravity established in London. It has the ring of ideal statesmanship, and if a succession of courageous Viceroys and Secretaries of State for a generation could be assured India would become as much an integral portion of his Britannic Majesty's dominions as any of the four parts of the United Kingdom. The provision in the last Budget for larger allotments for education and sanitation are also happy omens. The danger of a set-back will arise when and if a Tory Government comes to power and a Viceroy is appointed who may not have equal foresight or tact to persuade his subordinates to support a progressive policy.

Supervision of the financial administration is the first and most important necessity in every well-organised system of government. When the imposition of taxation and its expenditure are subject to proper control, or at any rate to effective criticism, the government can scarcely go wrong. When control or criticism is wanting, extravagance and wastefulness cannot be prevented. In order to prevent them, popular control by elected representatives has been devised. Some control by qualified persons that are not under the influence of officials is absolutely necessary for financial security.

The inquiry into the South African War proved the prevalence of immense wastefulness in the military administration. It cannot be less in Indian military administration, which is free from any form of unofficial control or inquiry. From the extravagance displayed in private life by Indian employes of the commissariat on small pay it is the general impression that

military financial administration is rotten to the core and needs a thorough overhauling for the sake of economy and efficiency. That overhauling it is hoped that the administration will receive at the hands of the Commission recently appointed by Government. The absence from the Commission of an Indian member will, however, hamper an effective inquiry.

In twelve years India's expenditure has increased from fifty-six to seventy-three millions, in spite of the abatement of fear of invasion by alliances and understandings, and in spite of the neglect of social progress, especially in the spheres of education and sanitation. These most important matters should be taken up by the State, and not left to depend upon the precarious and patronising benevolence of the wealthy, who naturally call the tune according to their own tastes and supposed interests. At present less than 2d. per head is spent by the Government on education, which is less than a tenth of what is spent on the Army. Only 10 per cent. of the male population can read and write; and of females only seven per thousand. One million persons—that is, one in three hundred—know English enough to communicate with each other in that language. An administration controlling a revenue of seventy-five millions can scarcely be called dutiful and efficient if it leaves the people in such shameful ignorance.

One advantage of an oligarchy is that a handful of individuals are trained from birth for the duties and responsibilities of leadership. So long as these individuals, though chosen from a very narrow area, do not get intoxicated by power nor forget the natural frailty and uncertainty of life, they may do well; but, as the tendency to conceit develops, some popular control is needed to counteract the mischief. Democracy, no less than oligarchy, has to act through leaders; and, as there is room only for a very few at the top, so long as these few are able and honest—and the wider area increases the chances—the State will prosper. The danger of democracy arises, as has happened sometimes in oligarchy, when large

numbers become able and cultured, and rivalry leads to jealousy and to subordination of national interests to personal success.

When India is favoured by fortune with the possession of good leaders, it will be their first duty to ascertain what sort of election or qualification is the best method of securing representation of the people in the bodies whose business it is to criticise the administration, and whether competition or selection is the more desirable policy for the appointment of the permanent staff of government. At home, even under Liberal Cabinets, the departments work under depressing conditions, with the deadweight of permanent official Toryism. In India that deadweight is necessarily stronger, in the absence of progressive alternation of control. There is no harm in entrusting authority with absolute power if it can be relied upon to be dutiful, impartial, and patriotic, as in Germany and Japan, or if it is open to criticism and dismissal for wrong-doing, as in England.

In the meantime the duty of cultured and thoughtful Indians is clear : to hold the ideal of making Aryanland a strong link in the Empire of Britain and a perfect model for mankind, by a blend of their own ideals and of the best European thought and culture, which the connection with Britain enables them to possess ; to imbibe the spirit of British Liberalism, not merely in politics, but particularly in religious and social matters ; to cast aside, as meant only for private or family use, social divisions and religious differences ; to cultivate the spirit of toleration and self-respect ; to feel for every countryman and countrywoman, poor or rich, humble or prominent, the same ardent sympathy in danger or difficulty as everybody feels for one's own brother, sister, daughter, or son ; and to work steadfastly and unobtrusively, with such help as noble minds of other lands and races may render, to regain for the motherland the respect she has lost by centuries of lassitude and sleep.

The development of children on the right lines depends upon parents and teachers having similar ideas as to how they should

be brought up ; and their prospects in life are imperilled if the parents and teachers differ, each wishing to train them in his own way and condemning and obstructing every other way. As in the family, so in the State, the growth and development of the Indian people as a nation are hindered as much by the inability of their own leaders and prominent men to unite upon a definite policy as by the thwarting of the more generous and liberal-minded authorities by their reactionary colleagues. Under such circumstances progress is necessarily slow. Slowness in a nation's life, indeed, is of minor consequence provided it does not lead to indifference and inaction ; but the tendency to dormancy of the virile faculties of the mind must be guarded against with vigilance, and the best safeguard is unity of high purpose. In a State, as in a family and every other institution, any disintegrating influence is disastrous in proportion to its extent and energy. While people speak of Empire and profess an anxiety for Unity, it is curious to observe in their words and acts a separatist tendency.

In recent years the deliberate policy of the authorities has been to disparage and degrade Indian leadership in the eyes of Indians in order to prevent a popular combination, which is of no use without leaders, and to raise the white-skinned foreigner in the estimation of the people. The difference in the attitude of officials, high and low, from governor to politician, towards Indians whatever may be their position in life, and towards Europeans, in their homes, in their offices, in Courts, and in public places, accentuates the distinction that has recently enabled even the foreign adventurer to pose as belonging to the ruling race. The attitude of Europeans towards Indian noblemen and gentlemen is also responsible for the want of respect for their masters now beginning to be manifested by the servant class. The creation of Rajas and Maharajas from private citizens was meant to degrade the great Princes in the eyes of the people. How much even foreign costume is appreciated is proved by the sight of Indians and dark-skinned

Eurasians in foreign garb receiving in public greater consideration than Princes in Indian dress. The controversy with regard to India is not between Britons and non-Britons, because the Indians as British subjects are as much Britons as people born in Britain ; it is a controversy between two schools of political opinion—the school that regards efficiency as the secret of experts and considers experts only those persons that have spent the best part of their life in India carefully avoiding contact with the Indian people, and the modern school, which looks upon the Indian problem as part of the whole problem that progressive statesmanship can alone solve by steadfastness to the principles that have animated the government of Britain.

In Indian affairs, as in Ireland, there is a party of ascendancy, which, having sprung from the British race or become by the circumstances of the position identified with it, possesses powers and privileges that have never in history been given up without a struggle. From ancient times to the present day no privileged class—with the unique exception of the nobles of Japan—has voluntarily surrendered its right from considerations of patriotism, or admitted the right of any other class to serve the State. There is the exclusive governing Service, which in the Indian atmosphere has become a caste into which non-officials, European or Indian, must not aspire to enter, and which detests reforms as likely to undermine its authority. Then, there are the uncultured aliens, who resent any attempt to interfere with their “imperial” prerogative of beating, kicking, and killing the “native” with impunity—a prerogative that they fear would receive short shrift if Indians were in power. Then again there are Britons that are afraid of loss to British commerce and prosperity if Indian adversity were relieved. There are yet other Britons who, unable to stem the tide of advancing democracy at home and in the Colonies, hope to find a congenial soil for their aristocratic notions in the most backward portion of the Empire ; but the weak point in their hope is the making of white-skinned people alone aristocrats—people that cannot be

permanent residents in India ; and thus the struggle between privilege and people has degenerated into racial animosity and bitterness, which cannot be removed except by the methods that have been successful in dealing with monopoly and privilege in Great Britain.

As regards the commercial and trading class, whose case is the most serious of all, there is no reason why, with inter-Empire Free Trade (if the Colonies permit it, or else barring the Colonies) and equal opportunities, Britain or any other part of the Empire should suffer any harm. One portion of the United Kingdom, or one county in England does not injure other parts or counties by producing or manufacturing particular commodities. When the interests of the whole Empire are recognised to be identical, no part or class will expect preferential treatment, or wish to benefit at the expense of another.

In Britain, in spite of the advance of democracy, it is still in the power of a handful of men to embarrass social progress and hinder the happiness of the people, believing, however mistakenly, that measures directed to these ends must necessarily be opposed to their own interests. The privileged class, however, is usually shrewd enough to give in when they find a strong majority of the people, led by the Ministers of the day, resolute for advance. The forces of reaction surrender through fear of revolution sweeping them away altogether : they prefer to retain something rather than to lose everything. In India, the forces opposed to progress are strong in the counsels of the authorities, so that any advance has to be made in the teeth of almost the whole official body and non-official opinion. It requires no little moral courage in a Viceroy, or Governor, or Member of Council, to advocate a measure that may anywise trench upon the privileges of the foreign section of the community. Even declarations of Indian policy by Liberal Ministers in Parliament have often to be so guarded as to be cheered by their opponents and received in silence by

their own party. This is the result of India being "kept out of party politics."

The Police is an important department of the Government, especially in a country where the vast mass is uneducated, needy, and apt to be easily led to crime. Individuals, and even Government departments, are liable to err, but no Government can retain the respect of the people if it hides, or whitewashes, or condones the errors of its servants in any department of the administration. In India, as perhaps in some more advanced countries, the Police and the prosecuting counsel are triumphant when they secure the conviction of an accused person, whether that person is or is not the real offender. It appears to be the view of the guardians of order that when an offence is committed it is necessary that somebody should be punished—even if it is an innocent party—for two reasons : first, because the conviction proves their efficiency in detecting crime ; and secondly—and this applies more to the higher authorities, who feel it their duty to back up their subordinates—because conviction even of a wrong person tends to deter others from crime, and perhaps has a sobering effect upon the real culprit. However plausible this reasoning may be held to be, it leads to outrage on justice. It is less harmful to society that several guilty parties should escape unpunished than that one innocent person should suffer wrong.

Some generous Britons, anxious for the good name of Britain and for the alleviation of human ills, condemn the Anglo-Indian Police for certain questionable conduct in relation to the detection of crime. The authorities admit that the Police have not yet attained the stage of development of the Police in Britain, where occasional cases of wrong-doing nevertheless come to light and have to be punished. The attempt to throw the blame on the people of India because the Police are mostly recruited from them is neither generous nor statesmanlike, as such excuses by responsible Ministers take the heart of Indian policemen out of their work and set up racial jealousy. It is scarcely

fair to throw blame for wrong-doing on Indian members of the force and reserve praise and reward for the European members when the Police as a body show capacity or its want. What should the authorities do when a case of wrong-doing becomes known to them? Surely it is their duty to show displeasure, and to punish the offender as he would be punished in England; or, if that be under present circumstances impolitic, to issue private orders to the superior officers that reprehensible conduct should be departmentally punished. If European British officers, who are the heads of the force, cannot be depended upon to improve and maintain the moral character of the men under their control, all hope of the force must be given up as forlorn. The service should be made attractive to honest and intelligent men as far as the finances of India permit; and the cost need not be prohibitive if injustice in authoritative quarters does not need a strong force to back it. It should, however, be remembered that reform and reconstruction in every department of human activity come slowly, while it is very easy to derange and to destroy.

It is not possible to disband the whole Police force because some evil exists in it. Neither the Government nor the people can do without the Police, any more than the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, however ardent for reform, can do without the subordinate officers that carry out their instructions. As a matter of everyday occurrence, evil gets into a system, individual or national, through momentary inattention, or through the disposition of a certain type of mind to defy the laws of nature or the principles of equity. Except for such defiance, no individual would fall ill or die prematurely, and no State would have to pass through periods of stress and storm. Troubles, however, cannot be avoided, seeing that it is impossible to secure a constant succession of absolutely high-principled men in Government posts, until education, intelligence, and honesty are universal. As matters stand, high principles, like other qualifications, are comparative, and all that human

ingenuity can do is to make the best of what is available. A conscientious ruler can only keep a watchful eye over the acts of his subordinates, and that is generally enough to keep them to their duty. There would be less noise about the shortcomings of the Police if their superiors enforced justice with stern determination.

In a recent trial of rioters at Berlin, evidence was given that an innocent and peaceable man, having gone near the riots to bring back his sixteen-year-old son, who had been tempted to go out to see the fun, was attacked by the police as a rioter and died of his wounds. The President of the Court remarked to the jury that "the police had exceeded their legal authority," and that "a person that in such a case defended himself against such brutality by means of a well-aimed revolver shot would in my opinion not be acting contrary to law." In India, as the possession of fire-arms by Indians not specially exempted is illegal, revolver shots are impossible in self-defence even against burglars, murderers, or wild animals; the only available weapons against oppressor or invader for offence or defence are stones and brickbats, and some people are afraid that authority may any day be upset by the use of these formidable weapons! Britons would doubtless be pleased if policemen, as well as governors, judges, and magistrates, possessed the time-honoured distinction of English barristers of being incapable of conscious unfairness and of being anxious only to discover the truth. In some parts of India there are judges who often condemn acts of the Police, and use almost the same language as the German judge; but, when they do so, reaction cries out, as it cannot do in Germany, that authority is being undermined by judicial action.

The reactionary apologists of the Indian Civil Service say that its members were placed in office to administer the existing system and not to change it. The Civil Service, being almost exclusively composed of Englishmen, Scotsmen, and Irishmen, might justly be expected to do its duty in whatever circum-

stances, to take up a reasonable attitude with regard to progress and reform, to move with the times, and to lead the national awakening which is the result of the British connection. It was generally believed at the time that the Civil Service as a body opposed Lord Ripon's policy of local self-government because, if successful, it would have diminished their power. Such an attitude may be a human weakness not necessarily proceeding from a love of power, but possibly from a patriotic and dutiful misgiving that others may not discharge their duties with the same honesty of purpose as the members of the Civil Service. The statesmanship, however, of every governing Service is not exhausted in discharging its routine duty to the best of its power and in guarding against changes that may in its opinion injure the public interests; there is the further duty of noting change of time and circumstances, and of taking the lead in desirable reforms.

By Acts of Parliament and under Royal Proclamation all offices have, nominally at least, been thrown open to all his Majesty's subjects without distinction of race or creed, yet studied attempts have been made to exclude Indians from the Civil Service by ingenious changes in the regulations of the competitive examination. In spite of this, however, several Indians have gained admission into this governing body. The check accordingly has had to be applied at a later point, and care has been taken by the superior authorities not to afford Indian civilians opportunities of rising to the highest posts. On one occasion when an Indian member of the Civil Service had attained the position of senior member of the Board of Revenue and was thus on the Lieutenant-Governor's going on leave the natural successor to the officiating post, the Indian was shifted to a Fisheries Commission, in order that his junior, an Englishman, should officiate as Governor. Recently an Indian has been admitted into the Viceroy's Executive Council, another into the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and two into the Secretary of State's Council. These are genuine

reforms and praiseworthy attempts to remove the bar that has hitherto prevented Indians from sharing the responsibilities and rights of British citizenship. The generous concession, however, has been accompanied by the ominous announcement that the number of Indians on those Councils or in the highest posts cannot be increased without risk to "British" rule. Whatever "British" rule may mean to those that so often use the phrase in and out of season, it does not appear to strike them that his Majesty's Indian subjects are as much British as subjects born in other parts of the Empire, and that if Indians are excluded from service for not being British they become aliens to the British Empire, and the "British" are aliens to India. Such exclusion of Indians from any post in any part of the Empire can have the effect only of encouraging a spirit of separatism and retaliation, under which it will be the aim and duty of Indians to exclude all but Indians from service in India. As matters stand, no Indian with any self-respect can accept a post in which he has to play the dummy, and to sacrifice his conscience and his duty to his Sovereign and country by becoming a tool in the hands of reaction for the degradation of his countrymen. The only condition on which an Indian can honourably serve the State is that he be given a free hand and an effective voice in advancing the interests of his countrymen and in raising them in the scale of nations. Progressives at any rate will admit that distinction in the service of the State between European and Asian on the ground of birth cannot be set up without recognising the claim of Peers as a class born to rule.

Service in the Judicial department is different. There Indian members have a free hand in interpreting and administering the law according to their capacity and conscience; and they have on that account distinguished themselves in the Judicial service more than many English members. It is not because they are more clever or acute or subtle, as they appear to the foreign critic, but because, like English judges and

magistrates at home (in Britain), Indian judges and magistrates understand the position better and decide fearlessly without prejudices to blind them. They will do just as well in the Executive line if similar freedom and opportunities are afforded them. If India is to form an integral portion of the Empire and as strong a link as any other in the chain, it is not in the least necessary that the policy of Government should be changed so as to favour Indians alone to the exclusion of other British subjects; but it is absolutely necessary that they should be admitted into all posts on a footing of equality with other Britons, and not be debarred from any post on account of being of Indian birth and blood. Indians have not yet caught the evil infection of selfishness introduced in some parts of the Empire with the result that natives of that portion are alone eligible to serve the Empire within its borders. They are still broad and liberal-minded enough to wish for equality of opportunity and fair play for every one; but, if the present policy of exclusion were to continue longer, it would be natural for them to imitate their fellow-subjects and to claim a monopoly of opportunity and of service in their own country.

While the world was advancing, while ideas were expanding in every country on the face of the globe, and while the seeds of expansion sown by great British statesmen in days of old were beginning to shoot forth, the policy of the constantly shifting authorities in India not merely remained in the old groove of conservatism and distrust of the people, but was actually, under the influence of the uncultured products of premature democracy, becoming more and more reactionary. The natural result now is that the relationship between the rulers and the people has become strained to breaking-point, and that nothing but a revolution in ideas of government can bring about peace. Reforms such as timid statesmanship may slowly grant are no longer capable of healing the breach. The doors to service under the Crown in every department of civil and military administration must be thrown open to the people of India in

the same manner as they have been opened in Britain and the Colonies. The excuse is usually made that their capacity has not been tested and that it may not come up to expectation. The capacity cannot be tested without affording opportunity for its exercise; and, even if it does not at once come up to expectation, it can go through the stages by which capacity in every other country has been developed. It gets always better opportunities of development when national enthusiasm receives free play than when it is suppressed, and all doors of progress are barred by fear and suspicion. The danger to the safety or well-being of the State cannot be greater when even untried capacity has free play than when all power is centred in the hands of a few families or of a class, whose self-complacency and sense of infallibility grow in proportion to the success with which any encroachment upon such power is resisted. The statesmanship that is wanted in India is statesmanship that will know how to discourage racial animosities and religious bigotry, and how to bring about a state of affairs in which mutual forbearance and respect shall govern all individuals and classes, and in which emulation shall be confined to the attainment of high character and the best qualification for the service of Sovereign and country. There is needed a revival of the statesmanship that will discern that exceptional measures in any portion of the Empire cease to be exceptional if continued longer than absolutely necessary, and that differential treatment of different parts is not the way to promote unity and solidarity among the various classes, creeds, and races that own allegiance to the Crown.

A difference of opinion is often manifested as regards the relationship of the Government of India with the Home Government. The opinion of the different parties is generally based upon the political and social tendencies and convictions of each. One school wishes the Indian Government to be wholly independent of the Home Government, and of the House of Commons, which is the source of power of the

Home Government. Its idea is that the "man on the spot" is infallible and omniscient, and that interference with his acts and wishes can only do harm. Even this school, however, does not hesitate to curb the "man on the spot" if he wishes to do anything not approved by itself. He is described as a "British officer" when his ways are reactionary and inhuman, and he ceases to be "British" when he combines generosity and justice with firmness.

Another school, whose tendencies are equally reactionary, thinks that the Government of India, being subordinate to the Government at home, has at the dictation of the London Cabinet to sacrifice the interests of the people of India whenever such interests clash with those of the people of Britain. In a recent debate on the Government of India Bill, Tory members displayed unusual anxiety for the retention of control by the House of Commons. Consistency can scarcely be expected of people whose ideas cannot go beyond selfishness in some shape or other. How the Government of India can at one time be independent of the Government at home, and at another time obey its orders, is a difficulty that is not explained. The main idea seems to be that the Government of India is to be under the thumb of the reactionaries both in India and at home, and so long as it does what they wish the Empire will, according to their ideas, prosper. Indian interests are to be paraded when necessary to support reactionary policy; but, when they stand in the way of the advancement of foreign privilege, the Government is to abdicate its function of safeguarding the interests of the people, and let others, who bear no responsibility, be arbiters of the destinies of their fellow-men. It may be pleasant to be arbiters, and especially irresponsible arbiters, but it is well to remember that arbiters being mortal are merely temporary instruments devised by a superior Power to advance happiness or misery as the nature of the case deserves, and that as soon as a consciousness of being arbiter springs in the mind one's judgment becomes unreliable and usefulness is destroyed.

A third school wishes the Government of India to maintain an attitude of prudent detachment; that is, like the impersonal God of Vedantism, to let all authority spring from it but not to interfere with the action of subordinates. This is a natural consequence of the idea of the first school, because, if the Government of India is to be independent of the control of the Government at home, or of the House of Commons, there is no reason why every local authority should not claim equal independence of a superior power, and ultimately of the Government of India. This may be called reactionary democracy, or the Vedantic system of political government.

A nation extends its sway over another by the superior force and wisdom of its rulers, and, when the extension is far away, those that rule at the heart cannot control their agents abroad, unless there is absolute discipline and sense of duty. Extended Empires decay and perish when the distant parts refuse to be influenced by the heart and reject the circulation of invigorating blood. The healthy conditions of the heart not reaching the outer limbs, the vitality of these naturally suffers, and in course of time, unless the outer limbs are amputated, they infect the heart with their ailments and weaken it. The wisest policy is, what is often proclaimed by statesmen and seldom followed owing to the difficulty of controlling subordinates, to establish a vigorous circulation between the heart and the extremities of the Empire.

When individuals or nations are in antagonism, as soon as the strife is ended with the victory of one side, they should shake hands and be friends. If animosity is introduced and fostered by the arrogant conduct of the victor, the sooner they part never to meet again the better it is for both. Otherwise, the vanquished becomes the arbiter of the destiny of the victor by leading him into cruel and dubious ways.

There is an impression that the amity of creeds and classes, and the solidity of the education that British contact and example were fostering, have been disturbed. If so, the dis-

turber is to be found among the self-idolising reactionaries whose evil influence with the Police and lower official bodies is ultimately responsible for the conveyance of poison. In Britain, men in public life without distinction of politics now vie with each other in encouraging education, and are praised even by political opponents for their attitude towards the education of the masses, and for their zeal in the cause of high education; and this although the Universities produce a majority of reactionaries, who believe, and give by votes effect to their belief, that oligarchic despotism is the best government for their country. In India, men receive commendation for discouraging high education or for attempting to suppress education altogether, because education seems to make people discontented with their lot, and authorities openly flout at the idea of compulsory education for the masses, while the Universities and schools have become the eyesore of reactionaries for being, according to official reports, the nurseries of unrest and progress. Affairs must have arrived at a serious stage when authorities or parents encourage and foster ignorance as the highest interest of those under their care.

While the desire of his Majesty's Indian subjects to serve the Crown is legitimate, the direction in which that desire is being developed is not justifiable. Others may set a bad example, but it is not right for descendants of Aryans to imitate it. Retaliation may at times be justifiable, but it does not serve any good purpose of individuals and races that are struggling to rise. The objection to the employment of Englishmen in the service of the Crown in India is as unjust as the objection of the reactionaries to let any but European Britons serve the State. One irreconcilable group wish Europeans to be excluded because of their nativity in Europe, just as another group wish to debar Indians owing to their birth in Asia. This is far from the way to bring about fellow-feeling, sympathy, and unity. The European reactionary contention, like all retrograde notions, is untenable, for the most ardent

advocate of European employment would hardly assert that every one born in Europe or of European parentage and endowed with a colourless skin is by mere reason of such birth and endowment fitted to serve the State in any capacity. If such an assertion were seriously made, the military and civil services should be opened free to all Europeans without further test of fitness. Besides, even in Britain, the Scotsman is generally acknowledged to be physically and morally stronger and intellectually superior to the Southern Briton, and is also of lighter complexion. Perhaps that is why Scotsmen are disproportionately numerous in high Governmental service. If distinctions are to prevail, Scotsmen ought to have a monopoly of service for the above reasons, and also because they are more liberal-minded than the Southern Britons. Natives of Southern Europe would be nowhere, because they are as dark in complexion as Asiatics. If, however, that position is given up, the reactionary trick of laying stress on European fitness is intended for the benefit, not of all Europeans, but only of a few whom the reactionary may favour at the expense of the Asiatic. It is a part of the same policy which in Britain advocates the claims of a few individuals endowed with "birth" or "blood" over those of the people as a whole. From a selfish point of view the claim is comprehensible, but is certainly not patriotic, because its assertion or recognition must tend to ill-feeling and disruption. If the Empire is to be consolidated or unified, every citizen must be given the opportunity of service, the only passport to such service being superior intellectual and moral qualification. In spite of Catholic emancipation, there are still certain offices in the United Kingdom from which his Majesty's Catholic subjects are excluded by law. This remnant of ancient intolerance is as unjust and impolitic as the exclusion of Asiatic Britons from any post in the State in Asia or Europe simply because without any voice in the matter they took their birth in a particular portion of the Empire. Indians, however, would do well not to imitate or adopt the reactionary European policy

of exclusion. With their high breeding and unified vision, they should not wish to exclude any one, in whichever part of the Empire born, from holding a position of authority, but should firmly insist that such holder should have both the will and the capacity to lead them for their good. Any objection on the ground, not of qualification, but of race and nativity, is disloyalty to the Empire of which one ought to be proud to be a citizen, and repudiation of the Fatherhood of God.

There is one matter in which Europe is undoubtedly doing harm to India, and from which there is no escape unless the spirit of Britain be changed. It is the modern worship of mammon, which in its worst forms is being introduced into every phase of Indian life. Asiatic Britons are no longer content with the satisfaction of the absolute necessities of life, but are misled by European example to love gold for the sake of gold and for the luxuries that gold commands, and to sell their souls for its acquisition. It is called "civilisation" to have no end of wants and to be never satisfied. The satisfaction of wants that extend the vision and usefulness of life is desirable, but wants that degrade life by leading it to luxuries and pleasures cannot be a part of civilised existence. The evil is observable in the increasing desire to gain more money for less work. It would be a blessing for India if in this matter she always remained "East" and never met the "West."

Statesmen that have the control of India's destinies would consult her future welfare if they refused to yield to the clamour of Indian servants of the State for equality with Europeans in the matter of salaries. In the first place, Europeans, who have to go a long way from home and practically into exile, and have to submit to manifold discomforts and inconveniences, are for such sacrifices entitled to higher pay than persons that serve the State in or near their home. Without comparatively high pay qualified and superior men cannot be secured from a distance. Secondly, the wants of the European, especially in a tropical climate, are much greater than those of Asiatics.

Thirdly, unless it is more economical in the broadest sense to employ Indian officers, there is no reason why preference should be given to them at the expense of Europeans, unless the latter should prove their ineradicable incapacity through racial prejudice or want of the sense of duty to the land they serve. Care, however, must be taken not to give greater importance to a post in virtue of its higher salary. If this is done, Indians would naturally resent being paid less for similar services. One example may be cited to prove how differential treatment may injure the public interest. In the Bengal educational service, as in some other Government departments, it was rightly decreed that Indians should receive three-fourths of the pay attached to a post when held by Europeans. After the change was sanctioned, a reactionary Director of Public Instruction used it as a reason to form the Indian incumbents, owing to their lower pay, into a lower branch of the service, the higher grade being reserved for Europeans alone. This action led the High Court Judges and other Indians to object to hold any post at a lower pay than Europeans, although by so doing the economical aspect of their claim is sacrificed. It proves, however, how incapable are some of the European officers of Government of comprehending the public interests and of advancing them without prejudices and prepossessions.

At a most critical stage of affairs, when a long antipathetic and reactionary domination has exasperated the people, it is fortunate for India, for Britain, and for the Empire that the Government should be in the hands of the Liberal Party, and that some of the most important Ministers of the Sovereign should be men that have risen from the people by force of character and ability, and combine an ardent popular sympathy with the love of order and progress. A Tory government at this crisis, with its motto of "unadulterated repression," might perhaps have gratified temporarily the reactionary fire-eaters, whose human feelings have been blunted by brutal selfishness, but it would have made a reconciliation between Britain and

A STUDY IN IDEALS

India impossible. Under the plea of guarding "British" interests, it would have dragged the Empire to destruction by militarism and disastrous economics at home, by racial domination in India, and by provocation of a combination of foreign Powers against the Empire. The long Tory rule has opened the eyes of the British elector to its real nature, in spite of its hypocrisies and professions ; and it is to be hoped that he will be sufficiently alive to his own interests to keep the Liberals in power a few years longer in order to enable progressive principles to get a firm hold of the administrative machinery. It has also been fortunate that a Viceroy whose worship of self surpassed his anxiety for the interests of the State, and whose American connections submerged his British instincts, was succeeded by sober, sympathetic, and liberal-minded statesmen, who had the tact to carry their subordinates with them in the measures of reform and reconstruction that they felt disposed to inaugurate. It is too much to expect that even such Viceroys, though supported by Liberal rule in Britain, should succeed in liberalising the Indian Civil Service ; but, if any appreciable number of the members of that body possess strength of character to resist non-official reactionary blandishments, the Empire of Britain may yet cast off antiquated methods, and advance in the direction of steady progress, unification, and happiness.

That service in an atmosphere of despotism is not always ruinous to character finds illustration in the attitude of some retired civilians when they return to live under democratic institutions. A ruler must be firm against clamour, but he must take care that firmness does not develop into obstinacy, a sense of infallibility, and the idea that it is against public policy to admit a mistake. Such caution is generated in despotism by democratic control. There are European Indian officials that prove useful in Britain after their retirement, because the atmosphere of India has not destroyed their virile instincts, and their despotic tendencies have not become so

encrusted as to make them unfit for service in a democracy. The very fact of their submitting to public opinion after a despotic career and continuing their public service under a democratic system shows how much more useful those officers would have proved in India if bureaucratic checks had not been placed upon their acts and thoughts.

When India was transferred from the Company to the Crown, the Crown became responsible for good government ; and, as Crown and Parliament are copartners in sovereignty, Parliament under the Constitution is the ultimate responsible authority, and the electors, who constitute and control Parliament, are equally responsible. The electors, however, are too much occupied in guarding their own liberties and in advancing their own welfare to have time to attend to the affairs of distant fellow-subjects. The Liberal Party in Britain, led by Liberal Ministers, will always do their best, in spite of underhand Anglo-Asiatic influences, to substitute in India brotherhood for racial strife. The statesmanship displayed by the manner in which after six years' reluctant support of "the settled fact" (the prompt unsettlement of which was impossible under the conditions of Indian government) the Asquith Government has conciliated Bengal by modifying its mischievous partition, and has granted other boons announced through the lips of the Sovereign himself at the Coronation Durbar, is evidence of how the King's Ministers, when Liberal, will gradually unify the Empire in one brotherhood. Indians will make a fatal mistake if they take the acts and words of the reactionaries in the Press or on the platform, or even in office, as the attitude of the British people. Should the reactionary party come to power (which is not likely so long as progressives are united), oppression, reaction, license for the "men on the spot," and "imperial" aggression within and without may be confidently expected. Even then, while the people would have to endure greater suffering, there would be the compensating advantage of a Liberal and vigilant Opposition, which would do its best to

press on the authorities the application of British principles and traditions, and to combat the effects of reactionary domination. But it is painful to contemplate the possibility of such an unnecessary struggle, when it could so easily be obviated.

Spain and Portugal, although self-governing European States, are suffering from the same malady as India—the domination of a privileged class, and its failure to provide decent and honest government for their peoples. Portugal has by a revolution been attempting to remedy matters. Governments can be honest only when, as in Britain, they do not provide lucrative posts for friends and partisans, but admit all without distinction of party to service under the Crown, and when they make serious efforts to grapple with disease, poverty, and illiteracy, in which a large proportion of the peoples are sunk.

It has been held by responsible authorities in England that the business of an Opposition is, not to provide a programme of its own, but to oppose the measures of the Government. In India, partisans of the existing order taunt the Indian opposition with being disloyal and seditious because they criticise the measures of the authorities, which they believe to be seldom calculated to advance the interests or welfare of the people. Popular interests there, as everywhere, consist in securing equal justice for all classes and equal opportunities of serving their Sovereign and country. In other countries foreigners have no chance of service or distinction, because they are considered untrustworthy and are not expected to be faithful to the interests of those countries. In India the tables are turned: only those that are expected to be faithful to the interests of the foreigner have any chance of service and distinction. The Indians are also declared to be unfit before they are given the opportunity of proving their fitness, while those that now enjoy the monopoly of civil and military service and the power of shaping the policy of the administration have not necessarily been required to prove any special fitness before

entering upon their career. Let Indians be given the same opportunities of training and of service as their English brethren enjoy—opportunities barred to them simply because of their birth in India—and, if they do not come up to expectation or fail to acquit themselves as well as the present holders of office, then—but not till then—let them be condemned. The impartiality, the wisdom, and the courage of the opponents of Indian aspirations may be gauged from their attitude toward the people, who, if they follow European methods are stigmatised as base imitators, and, if they stick to their own ways and traditions, are condemned as barbarians unfit for service under a civilised Government. Words and acts are laudable only when they proceed from people that hit the humour of their critics.

While there is a world-movement towards constitutional government and Parliamentary institutions, while even ultra-conservative China recognises the signs of the times and, after trying to set up without success a Constitutional Monarchy, is bent upon introducing the first Republic into Asia, the authorities in India continue to live and move in the grooves of antiquity, and think that blindness is the safest attribute of the rulers of men. This may serve for a time in India, where centuries of sleep have to be shaken off; but, unless in these fast-moving times, when all the world is being brought nearer together by modern scientific discoveries, unavoidable changes are introduced without pressure, the authorities can scarcely fail to be condemned for imbecility and incapacity, and the State that they control cannot escape decay and destruction. Old gangs may go; but, unless old games are laid aside, no change can be for the greater happiness of man.

Some good always springs out of evil. The violent attack on Bengalis by a prominent and popular European barrister in a speech at Calcutta in 1883 against Lord Ripon's policy brought about for the first time a combination among Bengali solicitors, whose refusal to give him briefs obliged the once

indispensable advocate to leave the country. Bengali nationalism may be said to have then first showed its life. Colonial policy, although dictated not so much by unreasoning prejudice against Asia and Asiatics as by economic causes, and especially by dislike of the competition of cheap labour, whether Asiatic or European, seems likely to have a beneficial effect upon India and Asia generally. A common cause, common sentiment, and common suffering are needed to generate among individuals and races fellow-feeling and the disposition to fraternise. What common allegiance to one Sovereign has failed to produce between India and the Colonies, what an alliance has not secured for the subjects of a great Asiatic Power, Colonial treatment will go far to produce and to secure. All races and creeds in India are united in their protest against Colonial action. While reactionary policy is attempting to set up animosity between Hindu and Mahomedan, Colonial action is doing its best to bring them to feel and act together. It will do more: it will make the pulse of all Asia beat in unison. Thus in the dispensation of Providence mischief is balanced by good.

It was chiefly economic causes that led the Colonials to wish to keep Asiatics and unskilled Europeans out of their countries. Moral reasons, which are stronger than economic, should lead Asia to keep out the ill-bred foreigner, whose brain gets puzzled by Asiatic suavity and intoxicated by a sense of his own importance. Asia is not yet strong enough to follow the example set by the Colonies and other countries; but, when she is strong enough, and if by that time the foreigners coming over have not learnt better manners, her first duty will be to deport or refuse entry to every unmannerly foreigner, who does more harm in Asia than the alien criminal does in European countries.

India, being a self-contained country able to produce her own food-stuffs and meet her own necessities, does not, like Britain, need free trade for the free importation of the

necessaries of life. In her present economic condition some well-wishers believe that protection is needed for the development of her industries. Protection always does harm in ousting fair competition, which is beneficial for the consumer, and in adopting artificial methods to restrict supply. What India, as well as other countries, needs is the stoppage of unfair competition, free rivalry, and fair exchange, and above all, the encouragement of indigenous industries.

The evil effects of forced and unnatural growth are apparent in the notion of independence. Great thinkers and writers introduced and advocated the notion, which received its final sanction by the success of the French Revolution. The idea has since spread all over Europe, in some parts of which it is kept in check by military despotism, and it is extending to Asia. The great minds that conceived it assumed, or wished to make, all mankind like themselves. Mankind not yet being uniformly alike, independence is developing into wilfulness, and introducing all the evils that spring from license. Instead of freedom of development along legitimate lines and admission of the equal right of all to live and thrive, independence has come to mean the right to do what one likes and to ignore duty and responsibility. With closer contact with the offshoots of Europe, where such license is common, the evil seed is being scattered all over the globe. With the disappearance of fear without a corresponding growth of discipline and sense of duty, the seed can be sterilised only by wisdom in authoritative quarters. Such wisdom, while allowing the spirit of independence to grow slowly along with other virile faculties, will guide its development. The spirit does harm enough in the cold phlegmatic temperament of northern latitudes; in the warmer, excitable, and sanguine atmosphere of India, its premature growth will be as disastrous as the civil war and the priestcraft that destroyed Aryan manhood at the commencement of the Christian Era. It is a good thing

for India that there is little chance of its sudden development, but attempts to retard its natural growth would be equally disastrous for mankind.

Bondage is not less onerous when the shackles are made of gold, instead of iron or steel. Reactionary despotism is no less injurious when exercised by fellow-countrymen than when exercised by foreigners. The Police in Germany and in Russia, although of the same nationality as the people, is as much disliked as, and much more meddlesome than, the Anglo-Indian Police. It is possible, indeed, for a despot whether native or foreign to be more anxious for the interests under his care than for the mere power and position he holds. Before seeking self-government India should make sure that those that would guide her destiny have shaken off the innate conservatism and dread of change of their race. A mixture of election and despotism appears at the present stage of society to be desirable, the principle of election being advanced in proportion as each community becomes fitted to exercise rightly the power of choice. The German Emperor is a despot, but a clever and patriotic despot. He feels his position secure and does not need to do things to please any class of his subjects. His partially English blood enables him to take a liberal view of affairs, although his environment may tell for reaction and repression. King George is free from such environment, and, if he would take up his legitimate sphere of sovereignty, unaffected by class or race prejudices and threats, he could make India worthy to be a British dominion, and enable Britain to be proud of India's companionship, devotion, and loyalty. A strong and clever despot, like a strong mind controlling the organs of sense and action, should have no difficulty in making his officers and subordinates do his bidding.

The more urgent needs in India, as in every other country, are intellectual education, physical training, and sanitation. The havoc of disease resulting from insanitary conditions and

from ignorance of physical needs is, according to official reports, sufficiently appalling, although in a country like India full and correct figures are difficult to obtain. Scientific men, who are impressed with the necessity of uprooting evil everywhere if mankind is to prosper, are always advocating sanitary measures to combat disease, but who is to carry out these measures, and where is the money needed to carry them out to come from? Superior persons, who have gained the public ear by posing as patriots, ridicule the demand of Indian progressives for political rights as ignoring social needs. Progressives show that they are wide awake to social needs; but they know very well that such needs will never receive adequate attention so long as the Indian people have no effective voice in the government of their own country, and so long as foreigners and wealthy Indians that live under luxurious conditions and have no experience of the daily life of the humbler classes control the policy and the expenditure of their Government.

Notions of heredity, bigotry, superstition, and separatism prevail more or less in every community, being the result generally of the tradition of uncultured ages, which the mind has not yet succeeded in shaking off; but their apotheosis has been achieved in India. The centralised system of the West, suited to a homogeneous people, cannot meet the needs of the differences of India based on caste, creed, race, province, and tribe. It would be judicious not to attempt to imitate the Western centralised system, but to encourage the development of each caste, creed, race, province, and tribe according to its own ideals to the goal of a brotherhood in which mutual respect and toleration would be the cardinal principle of existence.

In every human relationship there is bound to be a weak point resting on failings, faults, grievances, or incompatibility of temper. Where charity or a consciousness of human imperfections exists, the relationship is rendered tolerable by compromise. If grievances and weaknesses alone present them-

selves to the view and the counterbalancing advantages are ignored, no relationship can be pleasant or beneficial. Britain, being the dominant or sheltering partner, and having made the choice of her own free will, cannot complain of any faults on the other side or entertain any grievances, since they derogate the efficiency of her teaching for 150 years. There can scarcely be any not remediable by her; but, if there be, she always has the choice of ending the connection. India has no such choice; but, if she had the choice of other guardians, she would doubtless prefer British guardianship, not merely because it is the best available at present, but also because a change of guardianship is always undesirable and risky unless there is absolute certainty of securing a better guardian. As India has no choice in the matter, her proper course is to place before her guardian her grievances and wants, to try to secure a recognition of them gradually, if not of all at once, and to improve her position in the eyes of her protector as well as intrinsically and before mankind. India's apparent grievances may be thus enumerated:—

1. Partiality in the administration of justice between European and Indian.

Justice will never be placed above suspicion of partiality and prejudice so long as men without suitable training and legal experience are entrusted with judicial functions. It requires doubtless extraordinary courage to disturb the vested interests of the Civil Service; but it should be apparent to all fair-minded persons that Indian government will be placed on much stronger foundations if members of the Civil Service were to hold only executive posts and if all judicial functions from High Court Judgeship to Munsiffship were placed, as in Britain, in the hands of trained lawyers—experienced members of the British Bar and Indian Vakeels. Until this is done, "British" rule cannot be described as having fair play in India.

2. Personal ill-treatment, to which Indians of all classes are subjected whenever they come in contact with any European on the railways or at other public places.

Gentle persons do not come under this grievance ; but, as all Europeans in India claim to be of the dominant race and of gentle birth, true gentlemen and ladies have to suffer in reputation for their undesirable comrades. Such treatment cannot be stopped without adequate punishment of the aggressor, which is deemed impolitic by reactionary members of the Judiciary to whom political considerations are of greater importance than justice.

3. Racial distinction in the Civil Services of the State.

The Public Service Commission^{*} recommended the employment of Indians in the higher ranks of the Service in the proportion of one-sixth to five-sixths. The recommendation has remained practically a dead letter, although pious intentions to act up to it are now and again expressed in authoritative quarters. Even if that recommendation were acted upon, however, the Indian grievances would not be removed. Indians do not perceive why they should not have as free admission into all ranks of the Public Service as their fellow-subjects in other parts of the Empire. They do not object to any test of fitness, but they claim opportunity to prove their fitness. As for Europeans, nowhere in the Empire are they admitted into or ranked in the Public Service—except perhaps in the diplomatic and military services, where “blue blood” still has preference—according to the particular portion of the Empire or of the United Kingdom in which they have happened to be born. Scotsmen and Irishmen, although numerically a small fraction, occupy more of the prominent positions than Englishmen, who form the vast majority in numbers : they even control the Government. Nor are Colonials excluded from service owing to their birth in a distant part of the Empire, or to prejudices which unfit them from being impartial authorities. If a racial preference is displayed in the recruitment for the public services so that any race is debarred from fair opportunity, especially in its own portion of the Empire, such race will

^{*} Appointed in India in the 'eighties.

nurse a grievance until all other races are similarly excluded from service, at any rate within its own boundary, as the disqualified race is now debarred in every portion of the Empire. It is also essential that in the first appointments the best available men should be chosen solely for their merit, and not for their pliability. Able and clever men are likely to show more independence, and that is why a Minister declared in the House of Commons that it was the policy of governments to "choose mediocrities." It may be pleasant for higher authority to have submissive colleagues and subordinates, but a boycott of merit degrades any sphere of life. Besides, able men that accept service will be found to be much more loyal and trustworthy than mediocrities, who generally feel a greater anxiety for personal advancement than for public interests.

4. Inequality of opportunity in the military and naval service of the State.

All ranks of the fighting services must be open to all races and creeds, in order that no race or class may nurse the grievance of exclusion from serving their Sovereign and country, or cherish arrogance by reason of their superior position as defenders of the Empire. In Britain a large percentage of recruits is annually rejected for physical unfitness or deformity. The standard of fitness—moral and physical—may be made as high as possible, and it certainly ought to be made exceptionally high when the recruits may be drawn from two hundred millions of male Britons; but it should be the same for all British subjects, no individual being placed under a racial disability. If such disability is continued it is bound to end in civil war, as between the learned and fighting castes of Aryan India. Until the solution of the military problem is effected, neither the safety nor the unification of the Empire can be achieved. If, on the other hand, Indian Britons are deemed physically or morally unfit for such service they should receive in social life the chivalrous consideration which is accorded to women and children for their helplessness.

His Majesty's Government has recently admitted Indians into the Privy Council, the Secretary of State's Council, and the Viceroy's Executive Council, from all which they had previously been excluded. As Liberal statesmen they have recognised that there cannot be good and impartial administration until mutual respect, toleration, and sympathy are fostered among all races and creeds in the Empire by association in all its departments and by exclusion from none. The Government has displayed prudence in the declaration that the proportion of Indians in the Indian Civil Service cannot be higher than what the Public Service Commission recommended, as without such declaration all the vested interests and privileged orders would have risen in rebellion ; but, as there is no finality in politics or in national advancement, every patriotic citizen has been given the opportunity of striving for the abolition of racial or religious disqualification, so as to secure the unity and permanence of the Empire. If, however, racial disqualification in any shape is long continued, it will become the duty of Indians to insist that none but Indians shall control the destinies of the Indian portion of the Empire.

The solution of the religious problem in India is a matter of considerable difficulty when looked at from the point of view of the foreigner, of the bigot, or of the reactionary. Religiousness is ingrained in the Aryan nature, and any solid advance in social, political, or intellectual affairs can proceed only on the basis of strengthening the religious life. The masses of Europe are showing signs of undutifulness owing to the prevalence of agnosticism and to the absence of the Vedantic philosophy or its alternative—scientific training. Bigotry and misunderstanding, combined with the savage instincts of the uncultured mind, led India in past ages to a war of extermination, which, instead of exterminating dogmatism, only exterminated religiousness. The extension of education and the development of national life will lead to the conviction that religion is, like arrangements of one's household, a matter of personal concern, and that

one can worship or profess what principles one likes without intolerance and uncharitableness to the principles and professions of fellow-citizens. Moral training is absolutely necessary for the infant and youthful mind until it acquires the faculty of discrimination of good and evil, and moral training based on unsectarian teaching, which exists in every human faith may be imparted at all schools, leaving perfect freedom for sectarian teaching at home. In religion, as in politics, temper blinds reason, and a narrow outlook impairs the validity of judgment. Temper and narrowness, therefore, must be avoided, in order that the best teachings of all creeds may be available for the culture of the mind and the liberation of the soul.^{*}

The ancient sacred books of the Hindus consist of *Sruti* (direct revelation) and *Smriti* (memory, *i.e.*, originating from human authors). *Sruti*, being divine revelation, ranked above *Smriti*, but under the sway of priestcraft *purana* (old, *i.e.*, custom) sprang up, and, overriding both *Sruti* and *Smriti*, became the highest authority. The original Vedic prayer of a Hindu was: "From the unreal lead me to the true, from ignorance lead me to light, from death lead me to immortality." Under priestcraft the prayer became worldly, the worshippers praying for the satisfaction of their wants: "Giver of all good, grant unto thy devotee wealth, sons, and satisfaction of all desires." Brahmoism in Bengal and the Arya Samaj in North India are attempting to revert to the original prayer, and to lay the foundations of a popular social structure, and, although the fate of Buddhism suggests doubts of their success, the general enlightenment of mankind, the discoveries of science, and the diffusion of education may be expected to produce the desirable result—the reawakening of the true religiousness of Aryanism. Physical Science has taken the place of Vedantism in teaching mankind the unity of the origin and end of all created things.

^{*} For India's religious ideals, see the Author's work entitled, "The Problem of Existence." (Fisher Unwin.)

There are, unfortunately, many prominent Mahomedans that deliberately play into the hands of reactionary enemies of their country, who by fomenting religious antipathy hope to obstruct Indian union and advancement. The reasons of their action are not easy to fathom. It would be an injustice to their intelligence to attribute it to inability to foresee the inevitable results; though, in the case of their less-educated brethren, it may be the effect of ignorance. They cannot but perceive that their advocacy of justice and fair treatment of their countrymen in other parts of the Empire is hardly consistent with their admission of the inferiority of the vast masses of their compatriots that differ from them in religious faith. Besides, they choose to forget that in the history of mankind there has always existed a greater rivalry between the Crescent and the Cross than between Aryanism and Islam, and that China, Japan, and Turkey, by proclaiming religious toleration among their different creeds are leading all Asia to cast bigotry aside. It is the duty of rulers and leaders to lay greater stress on the civic duties of their people than on their theological differences.

The Hindus need not mind the taunts hurled at them by "pious" men and women of other lands and persuasions for being idolatrous and superstitious. The taunts will cease as soon as they manage to secure a firmer footing among the nations. Practices similar to those for which they are taunted are not unknown elsewhere. The worship of the Cross, its suspension round the neck, the emblems and pictures in churches, and the various rites and robes, and even the idea of holiness associated with places of worship—these are all relics of idolatry, found necessary to impress the ordinary mind, which cannot comprehend the essential spirituality of religion. In Islam, which practises iconoclasm so thoroughly as to object to have portraits of great Moslems, the sacredness and inviolability claimed for Mosques, the footprints of Mahomet on stones and similar relics preserved at Moslem shrines, are

emblems of idolatry. The stoning of a pedlar at Carpinone in the south of Italy in September, 1911, because the sanitary authorities, owing to cholera cases, tried to disinfect the wells which he was suspected of poisoning, the anti-Semitic riots in Wales in August, 1911, and the recent passing of a resolution by the Guardians of a London District refusing to deal with Jewish dairy and poultry farmers—such cases prove that superstition and religious bigotry are not yet extinct in Europe.

The great hindrances to reform—social, religious, or political—in India proceed from a variety of causes. Some of them exist in every country; but reform or progress is possible only when a strong and resolute band of men, united in their aims and methods, succeed in obtaining, at times at any rate, the help of the authorities of the day to advance its cause. In Britain, a general election decides whether progress or reaction is to be the policy of the government; and, as reaction, although it may be the favourite of landlords and plutocrats claiming privileges in virtue of birth and the power of the purse, cannot tempt the mass of electors to vote against their own interests (except when they are misled as to the facts), a progressive policy is generally triumphant (except where progressive forces quarrel among themselves). In an autocracy or despotism of any kind progress depends upon the office-holders being, like the leaders of the Liberal Party in Britain, imbued with the idea of change and promptly putting it into operation on the discovery of any defect or injustice in the administration or in the law. Failing such Liberal office-holders, States rush to revolution or to ruin.

All the hindrances that are potent in retarding human happiness have for centuries prevailed in India. Evil traditions, ignorance, religious bigotry, social persecution, timidity, interested opposition to progress—any one of which would be a serious incubus on a nation's growth and development—all flourish like a green bay-tree. But the psychological moment at which slumbering peoples begin to wake up into

life and bethink themselves of vindicating their nationality has now arrived. No human power can thwart the process, although it is possible to retard it by brutal opposition or shrewd patronage, unless the European nations that set the ball rolling in Asia set a different example. While nothing short of a miracle can arrest the influence of Europe in Asia, injudicious action may readily engender eternal enmity between the two Continents that have hitherto moulded human destiny.

A people that five hundred years before the birth of Christ (as the Greeks found when they invaded India a century later) had fully worked out their own culture and development unaffected by foreign influences—a people that in spite of successive waves of invasion and conquest for two thousand years have preserved their own unique life and literature, while all other races of like antiquity have disappeared into oblivion—are not going to be wiped out because they have not, like aristocratic Colonials and republican shopmen, taken life to be a struggle for the piling up of gold, and because they do not, like some of their fellow-subjects, threaten to break up the Empire by a separatist policy while proclaiming themselves to be the essence of its value and its strength.

One of the glories of the Aryans of India is that they are the only branch of the Indo-European family that has created and preserved a great national religion—Hinduism—and a great proselytising religion—Buddhism. The former is so constituted that none not born in it can belong to it. By this means its founders and consolidators hoped to keep the Indian Aryans apart from the rest of mankind, so that with entire freedom from foreign influence they might develop in their own way. The latter was so planned as to embrace all mankind in one brotherhood. All the other branches of the Indo-European race, far from displaying originality in the sphere of religion, have advanced in civilisation only by the adoption of a foreign faith. Aryan culture, like all

other ancient culture, was intellectual : the Intellect was developed at the expense of the Soul. As society advanced in learning and prosperity, instead of encouraging greater freedom in departments of life that advance happiness, it imposed restrictions at every step, with the result that both Soul and Intellect were cramped beyond the power of further development. With stagnation, decay set in.

From time immemorial Aryan thought in India, distinguishing between mind and matter, and recognising that matter is of short duration, beyond control, unstable, and consequently negligible, has directed all its efforts towards liberating the mind from its material associations and control. In so doing, it has too much overlooked material needs and the necessity of attending to them for the purposes of earthly existence. The result has been a check to material advancement, but its mental strength has preserved the material part itself from extinction. In the day of the lowest ebb of his fortunes, the Aryan has sustained his life and manhood by the thought that he has preserved in its original purity the ancient Aryan blood, and has successfully guarded from foreign contamination the religion, the philosophy, and the social system promulgated by his virile forefathers before the dawn of history.

It now lies with the Aryans of India to prove their blood and breeding by initiating reforms according to the needs of the time. In moral life and teaching they have nothing to learn from the foreigner. Let them but act up to the teachings of their ancient sages, and they will be as civilised and humane as Christianity has made the "Western" races. From these, however, the Aryans have to learn worldly wisdom and national organisation and conduct. Self-sacrifice is often preached by Indian leaders ; by which is meant the immolation of self to some idea connected with the Motherland. Self-sacrifice is not unknown to the Aryan genius, but it is much less useful in the form of physical sacrifice of self

than in the form of sacrifice of all the passions and prejudices that retard the growth of the mind. Such sacrifice can command success in physical as well as moral life, and it secures the help of superior forces in times of danger and difficulty.

The duty of the Aryans in India is clear. They have to remember that, although they have been brought by Providence under the care of the most liberal and orderly force extant among mankind, there are hindrances that bar the road to speedy progress. The hounds of reaction, masquerading in the garb of patriotism, are always howling at the heels of British Liberal statesmanship to divert its attention from the conditions that nurse the weed of evil among mankind. In the case of the Catholics, the Jews, the Colonies, and the householder, this statesmanship asserted its character and its power to silence the reactionary hounds. In the case of India such assertion is hindered by appeal to racial prejudice. It is always a good thing for man to encounter opposition in his career, because too easy progress not only diminishes the value of the prize but fails to develop the qualities without which no valuable prize can for long be retained. The Indian people are called upon to train their minds for participation in the rights and responsibilities of British citizenship, and to exercise the self-control and the steadfastness that helped the Catholic, the Jew, the householder, and the Colonial to gain their rightful status in the Empire. It is true that other powerful forces helped these in their struggle. India may be sure of obtaining similar help when she deserves it; and, if she does not obtain it from British statesmanship, she will under Providence find it elsewhere—as happened in the case of Greece, and of Italy, and in Japan's struggle against the Colossus of the North. By getting rid of antiquated institutions and traditions, by developing self-reliance, self-respect, and character, and above all by regulating individual life according to the highest principles of justice and humanity, India will secure the respect of the noblest and

most generous minds in every foreign land, and their help in her day of need.

The problems that confront British Indian statesmanship may be summed up as follows, and they are not so difficult of solution as satanic instruments try to make out.

1. To guard from possible injury European British capital invested in the country, without which it would be an arduous and prolonged effort to develop the resources of India and to advance its economic and material well-being. It is equally necessary to dissipate the notion that India is the protected market for England and that "British" commerce will be injured by India's economic development, or that "British" individual interest will suffer by the wider employment in all departments of all Britons—Asiatic and European—without distinction of race or creed.

With the progress of all classes and all portions of the Empire individual interests must necessarily suffer. The only question is whether the vested interests of a few individuals are more sacred than the advancement of the whole Empire—of all classes and races of which it is composed—with whose prosperity India would become much more than at present the best customer of the United Kingdom. With the growth of greater confidence and sympathy between the Government and the people, and between the European and Indian sections, "British" capital will be more attracted to India, where it will not only benefit the investor, who will enjoy greater security than in foreign countries, but also bind in firmer bonds the dominions owing allegiance to the Crown.

2. To induce the different races and classes in India to feel, as they feel in Britain, that the Government is their own, and that, while the different sections may be engaged in friendly rivalry to advance their own separate interests, any attempt to weaken the Government by making it partial to any race or class is fraught with danger to the State and to general well-being.

3. To satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the landed gentry and the educated class created mainly by Liberal statesmanship, "British" teaching, and "British" example, so that they may form a bulwark against disorder within and danger without.

The educated class in India is placed at a disadvantage in having to compete with European fellow-subjects that have had for several generations much greater facilities for acquiring knowledge and getting a start in life. If, instead of being helped out of this difficulty, the Indians are further handicapped by racial disqualification, the future of India, which can be best developed by an enlightened and dutiful upper and middle class permanently interested in its welfare, will be gloomy indeed.

4. To restore to the mind of the masses their earlier conviction that impartial justice may be looked for from British tribunals—European and Indian—and that order and contentment will enable them to improve their condition, which is at present a struggle against chronic hunger and disease.

5. To encourage and foster, as a matter of duty, the education of the people in all departments of life, and to blend the best teachings of the East and the West, so that the people may feel and retain through life the same veneration for their European instructors as tradition enjoins them to feel for their own *gurus* (preceptors). The desire to secure veneration by an assertion of racial superiority has been and will be a fatal blunder. Education in Britain, which has hitherto been open to Asiatics, is becoming every day more difficult—especially for Indians—to secure, owing to the growing influence and numbers of Colonial students with their prejudices and bad manners at schools and colleges, and also owing to their exclusion from workshops, engineering establishments, and mercantile offices. If authorities do not interfere to counteract the evil, further estrangement between Britain and India will be caused by Indian students having to

proceed to foreign countries for training in all departments of life.

Given fair treatment and reasonable economic conditions, there is no reason why his Majesty's Indian subjects should not feel the same pride in British citizenship as their European brethren, or why the honour and glory of the Empire should not be of equal concern to all that have in the past contributed, are now contributing, and are ready to contribute in the future, their blood and treasure to rear and to defend the Empire. The educated and well-to-do classes in India are no more disaffected towards the Government than are the toiling masses in Britain. Both have the laudable desire to improve their status as well as the machinery of administration according to the needs of the time, and to have a larger voice in moulding national policy. Both need the addition of a sense of responsibility to the newly awakened consciousness of rights. The Indian people, not having the means possessed by Europeans of changing unpopular rulers, are apt to identify the Government with the reactionary officials, who, although numerically few, are disposed to exaggerate their own importance, and are influenced by personal considerations to deviate from the impartial attitude appertaining to representatives of authority. In a less despotic atmosphere European British officers may be expected to display greater resourcefulness.

It is impossible to retain the contact of India with Britain and expect that each will not feel the influence of the other. With much less contact with modern conditions, other Asiatic States have deemed it right to rely more on the popular will. In India the need is more urgent, since the highest officers of Government are not natives of the country, and, in addition to being alien in race and in religion, are constantly shifting and anxious to get away from the country. Such rulers cannot in the nature of things feel any adequate interest in the social improvement of the people, or initiate social reforms, which are more necessary than political changes. Want of

sympathy between rulers and ruled may be helpful to the foreign invader, but cannot promote the welfare of India or of Britain. There is natural hesitation to let India have the full benefit of the British connection, and it is possible to go too fast for all the good to be properly assimilated. Old wines and new bottles, or old bottles and new wines, when they have to fit each other, may cause anxiety; but, as no escape is possible, delay and timidity may prove more injurious than haste and rashness. If Briton and Boer, who were mortal enemies in 1902, could be brothers in 1907, if Colonial "mill-stones round our necks" could in a short space of time owing to a sympathetic Colonial Minister become "Britains," it would be unnatural if a generous policy guided by paternal interest should not make all classes and races in India as loyal and devoted to the Crown as Britons in other parts of the Empire. Should such a policy not be feasible, Britain will have to choose between giving up India to the first invader and giving herself up to militarism. An unwise or ungenerous policy in Europe and America—and recently even in parts of Asia—leads sooner or later to the overthrow, by peaceful or by forcible methods, of the Government that adopts it. India, or any considerable section of the people, has not yet arrived at that stage which at any rate dissuades foreign Powers to hope to profit by Britain's misfortune.

A remarkable change in the atmosphere of India has recently taken place by the unprecedented visit of the King and Queen to their Indian dominions, by their personal anxiety for the happiness and welfare of their Indian subjects, and by the affection and devotion to their Majesties' persons evoked by their graciousness. That visit and its attendant good consequences would have been impossible if King George on his accession to the Throne had not been surrounded by Liberal advisers. How different in spirit and wholesome in results his Coronation Durbar has been in comparison with the vapid "Imperial" pageantries celebrated under reactionary adminis-

trations! The beneficial effects of King George's concern for his Indian subjects will, however, be lasting only if he continues to have progressive Ministers who can alone have the courage, wisdom, and foresight to withstand the opposition of lethargic and timid bureaucrats to timely reforms and to measures that may promote harmony and sense of unity among the classes, creeds, and races that own allegiance to the Crown. The glowing words spoken in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, words that would meet with a generous response in the heart of every true Briton, Asian or European, indicate the destiny of the Empire of Britain and the goal towards which Indian idealism has to direct its energies :—

“We can see, or we can look forward at any rate to seeing, each bringing his own tributary to the mingling and confluent waters in the stream of Imperial Unity—One Throne, One Empire, One People, diverse in origin and race, but all alike charged and endowed in the fullest measure with liberty and responsibility for self-government in their own local affairs—One People in the sense that they are one in heart and spirit. That surely is the goal of real Imperialism, and it is to that goal that our steps are set.”

So rich in potentiality as to be able to absorb the greater part of European British trade, so numerous in population as to supply the largest number of combatants that any country or Empire can produce, so loyal and patriotic as always to be ready to come to the help of the heart of the Empire in time of need, so fruitful and self-contained as never to depend upon imports for its food supply, India should be in the not distant future, as it was in the past before other portions of the Empire snatched its splendour, the brightest jewel in the British Crown.

The great need for Aryanland is to regain her self-respect, without which she cannot gain the respect of foreign nations and enter into unity with them. Socially and economically she requires to gain freedom of development on rational and

modern lines. Her agriculture and industries cry to be placed on a progressive basis. She must aspire to be once more the cradle of brave men and of courageous and self-reliant women. In the realms of the arts and of the exact sciences, she longs to come into line with the advanced nations of the day, and to vie with them in contributing her share to the general advance. By resolutely labouring to better the condition of her womanhood (the mothers of future generations), to exorcise the evil spirit of intolerance from her religion, to elevate the minds of the masses from superstitious degradation, and to spread physical and moral culture, and above all by responding to the great throb for the Motherland, which drowns all appetites, passions, and prejudice—thus will the present dwellers of India prove their descent from Aryan forefathers, and take their rightful place among the nations of men.

**The Gresham Press,
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED,
WOKING AND LONDON.**

